This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

B 388798

Google

1837
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

Digitized by Google

BS
18
.18
N5
N.
Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Reference

BS
185
.1873
N5
N.T.
v.3

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

18726

THE

# HOLY BIBLE

ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION (A.D. 1611)

WITH AN EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL

## Commentary

AND

## A Revision of the Translation

BY BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY

OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

GENERAL LIBRARY University of MICHIGAN

EDITED

BY F. C. COOK, M.A., CANON OF EXETER

LATE PREACHER AT LINCOLN'S INN, CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN

NEW TESTAMENT

VOL. III.

*ROMANS TO PHILEMON*

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
743 AND 745 BROADWAY
1881

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

## ROMANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE REV. E. H. GIFFORD, D.D., RECTOR OF MUCH HADHAM, EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

pp. 1–238.





Digitized by Google

# I. CORINTHIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE REV. CANON EVANS, PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

pp. 239–376.



# II. CORINTHIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE REV. JOSEPH WAITE.

pp. 377–481.



# GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE VERY REV. J. S. HOWSON, DEAN OF CHESTER.

pp. 483–536.



Digitized by Google

# EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE REV. F. MEYRICK, PREBENDARY, EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN, RECTOR OF BLICKLING.

pp. 537–578.



---

# PHILIPPIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE VERY REV. J. GWYNN, DEAN OF RAPHOE.

pp. 579–641.



---

# COLOSSIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE LORD BISHOP OF DERRY.

pp. 643–685.



Digitized by Google

# I. THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE LORD BISHOP OF DERRY

pp. 687–731.



Digitized by Google

# II. THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY, AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE LORD BISHOP OF DERRY.

pp. 704, 732–748.



# TIMOTHY AND TITUS,

## THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

INTRODUCTION. BY THE REV. H. WACE, M.A., PREACHER OF LINCOLN'S INN, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

Digitized by Google

COMMENTARY AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

pp. 760–818.



---

# PHILEMON.

INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY THE LORD BISHOP OF DERRY.

pp. 819–844.



Digitized by Google

# ROMANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



### § 1. AUTHORSHIP.

THE title of the Epistle in the oldest manuscripts is simply πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, "To the Romans:" but the first word of the Epistle itself names St. Paul as its author, and it has been universally accepted in all ages as his genuine work.

It is quoted very early, though not, as some have supposed, in the New Testament itself.

Thus in 2 Pet. iii. 15 there is an allusion to St. Paul's teaching, which in consequence of a slight resemblance in the language has been thought to refer especially to Rom. ii. 4; but St. Peter, as the context clearly shows, is referring to the moral exhortation found in all St. Paul's Epistles, based as it commonly is on the expectation of Christ's second coming.

The supposed allusion in St. James (ii. 14) to St. Paul's teaching in the Epistle to the Romans is inconsistent with the friendly and confidential intercourse of these two Apostles (Acts xv. 4, 25; Gal. ii. 9), and with the earlier date at which St. James most probably wrote. On this point, however, the reader must refer to the full discussion in the Commentary on St. James.

But the Epistle is certainly quoted before the end of the 1st century by Clement of Rome in a passage which will be found in the Additional Note on i. 32: in the 2nd century it is quoted by Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus: the last-named Father repeatedly and expressly refers to it as the work of St. Paul (III. xvi. 3, 9). The internal evidence of its genuineness has carried conviction to the minds of the most cautious and the most sceptical of critics. Every chapter, in fact, bears the impress of the same mind from which the Epistles to the Churches of Corinth and Galatia undoubtedly proceeded; and even Baur and the critics of his school, who make every effort to prove the two last chapters spurious, are obliged to admit that the rest of the Epistle is the genuine work of St. Paul.

### § 2. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The passages which contain definite historical statements indicating the time and place at which the Epistle was written are all contained in the last two chapters, xv. 25–31; xvi. 1, 2, 21, 23.

But the time and place of writing can also be inferred with great probability from indirect evidence contained in i. 10, 11, 13.

This latter proof is quite independent



Digitized by Google

of the former, and when combined with it forms an undesigned coincidence between the first and last chapters of the Epistle, and a valuable confirmation of the genuineness of chapters xv. and xvi., which of late years has been much disputed.

I. *Notes of Time and Place in xv., xvi.*

At the time of writing this Epistle St. Paul was going to carry to the poor saints at Jerusalem a contribution made for them in Macedonia and Achaia (xv. 25, 26), and he hoped afterwards to visit Rome on his way to Spain (xv. 28). If we compare these passages with Acts xix. 21 and xx. 3, it is clear that the Epistle must have been written after the Apostle's arrival in Greece on his third missionary journey, when he spent three months in Corinth.

The same conclusion follows from comparing Romans xv. 25–28 with 1 Cor. xvi. 1–5, and 2 Cor. viii. 1–4, ix. 1, 2. In presence of the hostile criticism which is directed against the historical value of the Acts, it is worth notice that this second proof is independent of St. Luke's narrative.

Assuming, however, as we justly may, the authenticity and accuracy of St. Luke's history, we can fix almost within a week the date at which our Epistle was despatched.

For we learn from Acts xx. 3 that, as St. Paul was about to sail from Corinth into Syria, the Jews laid wait for him, and on this account he changed his route at the last moment and determined to return through Macedonia.

The Epistle, if written after these incidents, would almost certainly have contained some reference to them, and especially to the plot of the Jews, which the Apostle could not have failed to notice in alluding to the enmity of his countrymen in ch. xv. 31. We may, therefore, confidently infer that the letter was despatched before St. Paul actually left Achaia, and yet not long before (xv. 25).

The winter was at an end and navigation had recommenced, for "*he was about to sail into Syria*" (Acts xx. 3). Yet the spring was not far advanced, for after travelling through Macedonia to Miletus (Acts xx. 16) he still hoped to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost.

We can fix the season even more exactly: for St. Paul and his company spent "*the days of unleavened bread*" at Philippi (Acts xx. 6), and must therefore have left Corinth some time before the Passover.

The proof that the Epistle was written from Corinth is well stated by Theodoret: "First, he commends to them Phœbe, calling her a deaconess of the Church at Cenchreæ (xvi. 1); and Cenchreæ is a port of the Corinthians. And then he also speaks thus: '*Gaius mine host saluteth you*' (xvi. 23). Now that Gaius was of Corinth is easy to learn from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, for he writes to them thus: '*I thank my God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius*' (1 Cor. i. 14).

To these arguments of Theodoret we may add that four of the seven persons named in Rom. xvi. 21–23—Timotheus, Sosipater, Jason, and Gaius—can be shown with great probability to have been with St. Paul during his second abode at Corinth. The conclusion from these various proofs is that the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth shortly before Easter A.D. 58.

II. *Indications of Time in i.* 10–13.

We read in this passage that the writer has not yet been at Rome, but is longing to visit the believers there, and has "*oftentimes purposed*" to come unto them, but has been "*hindered hitherto.*" This purpose of visiting Rome St. Paul *publicly declared* during the latter part of his abode at Ephesus: "*After these things were ended Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome*" (Acts xix. 21).

We do not know how long the Apostle had entertained the purpose here for the first time recorded: there is no indication nor probability that it entered into the plan of his first journey to Europe

Digitized by Google

(Acts xvi. 9—xviii. 18). But we may conjecture with some probability that the desire to visit Rome had been first kindled by St. Paul's intercourse with Aquila and Priscilla when they had lately come from Italy to Corinth (Acts xviii. 1), and fostered by constant association with them during the journey from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 26; xix. 1, 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 19). The distinct purpose therefore of visiting Rome could hardly have been formed *before* St. Paul's abode at Ephesus, nor could the statement in Rom. i. 10–13 have been made *before* the latter part of that period, a considerable lapse of time being implied in the words "*oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, but was let hitherto.*"

Again, by comparison with the contents of the Corinthian Epistles it may be clearly proved that the Epistle to the Romans must have been written *after* 2 Corinthians (see Bp. Lightfoot, 'Galatians,' p. 48): that is to say, *after* the latter part of the year 57. Thus we are brought very close to the time indicated in Rom. xv., xvi., and have found an independent proof of the correctness of the dates given in those chapters.

### § 3. Language.

Salmeron (Proleg. I. 35) supposed the Epistle to have been originally composed in Latin, because it was addressed to Latins, written by an amanuensis who bore a Latin name, Tertius, and dictated by an Apostle who must have known Latin, as having the gift of tongues. Cornelius à Lapide discusses this fanciful notion, and modifies it by suggesting that St. Paul's Greek autograph was translated into Latin by Tertius and the translation sent to Rome. The error arose from ignorance of the fact, now well established, that for a considerable part of the first three centuries "the Church of Rome, and most if not all the Churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organisation Greek, their writers Greek, their Scriptures Greek" (Milman, 'Latin Christianity,' I. i.).

Accordingly, in the Epistle itself we find St. Paul classifying mankind as "Greeks and Barbarians" (i. 14) or "Jews and Greeks" (i. 16; ii. 9, 10; iii. 9; x. 12); and in the salutations in ch. xvi. the names both of Jewish and Gentile converts are nearly all Greek.

### § 4. Jews in Rome.

When we pass from the author to his readers, our thoughts turn first to the origin of the Jewish colony in Rome. The first embassy sent from Jerusalem to Rome by Judas Maccabæus, B.C. 161, obtained from the Senate a treaty of mutual defence and friendship, which was renewed successively by Jonathan, B.C. 144, by Simon, B.C. 141, and by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129: see 1 Macc. viii. 17, xii. 1, xiv. 24; and Josephus, 'Antiq.' xiii. 1.

Of the Jews who came to Rome in the train of these frequent embassies some would certainly settle there, for the commercial advantages of residence in the great capital would not be neglected by the enterprising race which was rapidly spreading over all the civilised world.

The first notice in Latin literature of the Jews in Rome seems to be the well-known passage in Cicero's defence of L. Valerius Flaccus (c. 28), where we learn that the Jews were accustomed to send gold every year from Italy to Jerusalem, and formed in Rome itself a faction so numerous and formidable that the great orator points to them as thronging at that moment the steps of the Aurelian tribunal, and lowers his voice in pretended terror lest they should overhear his words. These wealthy and influential Jews must have been settled in Rome long before the captives whom Pompey brought from Jerusalem to adorn his triumph only two years before the date of Cicero's oration, B.C. 59.

But Pompey's captives were in course of time set free by those who had bought them for slaves (Philo, Jud. 'de Legat.' c. 23), and the Jewish community in Rome was thus greatly increased. Julius Cæsar treated them with singular favour, and expressly sanctioned their worship



Digitized by Google

in their synagogues (Jos. 'Antiq.' xiv. c. 10, 8), and the same privileges were continued by Augustus and Tiberius (Philo, ib.). "The great division of Rome which is on the other side of the Tiber was occupied by the Jews" (Philo), and so numerous were they, that when Archelaus came to Rome (A.D. 2) to secure the succession on the death of Herod, 8000 of the Jews dwelling in Rome took part against him (Jos. 'B. J.' ii. 6; 'Antiq.' xvii. c. 11, 1).

The favour of the Cæsars was in marked contrast to the contempt and hatred with which the Romans in general looked upon the Jews. Cicero calls them a nation "born for slavery" ('De Prov.' c. 10), and their religion a barbarous superstition, abhorrent to the ancestral institutions of Rome and to the glory of its empire ('Pro Flacco,' c. 28). Horace refers to their proselytising zeal (1 'Sat.' iv. 143), their seeming credulity (v. 100), and the mingled contempt and fear with which their religious rites were regarded (x. 69–72). Josephus ('Antiq.' xviii. 3, 5) tells how the fraud which four Jewish impostors practised on one of their female converts moved Tiberius to expel all Jews from Rome and send 4000 of them to serve as soldiers in Sardinia. But neither exile nor persecution, though repeated under successive Emperors, could drive the Jews permanently from Rome. They soon returned, and their power so increased that, in Seneca's words (August. 'de Civ. D.' vi. 11), "the conquered race gave laws to its conquerors."

### § 5. Christians in Rome.

If we ask at what time and by whom the Gospel was first preached at Rome, we have to consider sundry answers presented by ecclesiastical tradition.

First we are told in the Clementine Homilies that in the reign of Tiberius tidings came to Rome "that a certain one in Judæa, beginning in the spring season, was preaching to the Jews the kingdom of the invisible God," and working many wonderful miracles and signs (Hom. i. c. 6).

"In the same year in the autumn season a certain one standing in a public place cried and said, "Men of Rome, hearken. The Son of God is come in Judæa, proclaiming eternal life to all who will, if they shall live according to the counsel of the Father, who hath sent Him" (c. 7).

These statements of the Pseudo-Clement are of course purely fictitious.

Another marvellous story is recorded by Tertullian ('Apologeticus,' c. 5): "Tiberius, accordingly, in whose days the Christian name made its entry into the world, having himself received intelligence from Palestine of events which had clearly shown the truth of Christ's divinity, brought the matter before the Senate, with his own decision in favour of Christ. The Senate, because it had not given the approval itself, rejected his proposal."

The tale bears on its face all the marks of untruth (Neander, 'Church History,' i. 128), and Tertullian, who was no critic, had probably been deceived by some of the many spurious "Acts of Pilate."

We come next to two traditions, perfectly distinct in their origin, which ascribe the foundation of the church at Rome to St. Peter.

A. The former of these traditions, which represents St. Peter as preaching at Rome in the reign of Claudius, arose as follows:—

(1) Justin Martyr in his first Apology, addressed to Antoninus Pius, writes thus (c. 26): "There was one Simon, a Samaritan, of the village called Gitton, who in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, and in your royal city of Rome, did mighty feats of magic by the art of dæmons working in him. He was considered a god, and as a god was honoured among you with a statue, which statue was set up in the river Tiber between the two bridges, and bears this inscription in Latin:

"'Simoni Deo Sancto;'

which is,

'To Simon the holy God.'"

The substance of this story is repeated by Irenæus ('adv. Hær.' I. xxiii. 1), and by Tertullian ('Apol.' c. 13), who re-

Digitized by Google

proaches the Romans for installing Simon Magus in their Pantheon, and giving him a statue and the title "Holy God."

In A.D. 1574 a stone, which had formed the base of a statue, was dug up on the site described by Justin, the island in the Tiber, bearing an inscription: "Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum," &c. Hence it has been supposed that Justin mistook a statue of the Sabine God, "Semo Sancus," for one of Simon Magus. See the notes in Otto's Justin Martyr and Stieren's Irenæus.

On the other hand Tillemont ('Mémoires,' t. ii. p. 482) maintains that Justin in an Apology addressed to the emperor and written in Rome itself cannot reasonably be supposed to have fallen into so manifest an error.

Whichever view we take of Justin's accuracy concerning the inscription and the statue, there is nothing improbable in his statement that Simon Magus was at Rome in the reign of Claudius. Only we must observe that Justin says not one word about *St. Peter's* alleged visit to Rome and his encounter with Simon Magus.

(2.) Papias, "a man of very small mind" (Euseb. 'Eccl. Hist.' iii. 39) says that the Presbyter John used to say that Mark, "the interpreter of Peter," recorded his teaching accurately.

Here there is no mention of *Simon Magus*, nor of the *time* and *place* of St. Peter's preaching.

(3.) Clement of Alexandria (c. A.D. 200), quoted by Eusebius ('E. H.' vi. 14), repeats "a tradition from the elders of former times," that "after Peter had publicly preached the word in Rome," Mark at the request of the hearers wrote what he had said, and so composed his gospel.

Here again the *time* of Peter's preaching at Rome is not mentioned.

Before we pass on it is most important to observe that these traditions preserved by Papias and Clement have not the slightest connexion of *persons*, *time*, or *place*, with Justin Martyr's story of Simon Magus.

(4.) Eusebius in his 'Ecclesiastical History' (c. A.D. 325), quotes Justin Martyr's story about Simon Magus ('E. H.' ii. c. 13), and then, without referring to any authority, goes on to assert (c. 14) that "immediately in the same reign of Claudius divine Providence led Peter the Great Apostle to Rome to encounter this great destroyer of life," and that he thus brought the light of the Gospel from the East to those in the West.

As the date of this visit to Rome Eusebius in the 'Chronicon' gives A.D. 42, and says that Peter remained at Rome twenty years (see Canon Cook's article "Peter" in the 'Dictionary of the Bible').

This arbitrary and erroneous combination of traditions, which had no original connexion, may possibly have been suggested to Eusebius by the historical connexion between Simon Magus and St. Peter in Acts viii., or more probably he may have borrowed it from the strange fictions of the 'Clementine Recognitions' and 'Homilies,' and 'Apostolic Constitutions.' (See 'Recognitions,' iii. 63–65; 'Homilies,' I. xv. lviii.; 'Epistle of Clement to James,' c. i.; 'Apost. Constit.' vi., viii., ix.)

That St. Peter was not at Rome, and had not previously been there, when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, may be safely inferred from its silence concerning him, and from the fact that there is not a particle of trustworthy evidence in favour of any earlier visit.

B. The other tradition, which represents the Roman Church to have been founded by St. Peter and St. Paul jointly, rests on the following authorities.

(1.) Irenæus III. c. 1: "Matthew published a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, at the time when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome and founding the Church. But after their departure (or according to a various reading, after Matthew's publication) Mark also the disciple and interpreter of Peter handed down to us in writing what was preached by Peter." Eusebius ('Eccles. Hist.' v. 8) cites this passage without noticing that it is inconsistent with his own statements in ii. 15 concerning the earlier foundation of the Roman Church by St. Peter, inasmuch as it expressly ascribes

Digitized by Google

the foundation (θεμελιούντων) of that church to the simultaneous preaching of the two Apostles, which cannot possibly be assigned to that earlier date in the reign of Claudius.

(2.) Irenæus III. c. iii. 2: "The greatest and most ancient and universally known Church, founded and established in Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul."

Id. III. c. iii. 3. "Having therefore founded and built up the Church the blessed Apostles entrusted its episcopal ministration to the hands of Linus."

(3.) Euseb. 'Eccl. Hist.' ii. 25: "Paul is related to have been beheaded in Rome itself, and Peter likewise to have been crucified in his (Nero's) time. And the story is accredited by the appellation of Peter and Paul having prevailed up to the present time on the tombs there (κοιμητηρίων)."

(4.) Ibid. Dionysius of Corinth writing to the Romans calls both their Church and that of Corinth a joint plantation of Peter and Paul, and adds that "having gone to Italy and taught together there they died as martyrs at the same time."

The tradition embodied in these passages clearly refers to the time of Nero's persecution, six or seven years later than the Epistle to the Romans, and throws no light upon the origin and earliest organisation of the Roman Church.

The Epistle itself, compared with the narrative in Acts, is the only trustworthy source of information on these points.

From i. 8–13 and xv. 23 it is certain that there had been for "*many years*" in Rome a considerable body of Christians whom St. Paul had a great desire to visit in person, but had hitherto been hindered.

This desire to visit them, and to have some fruit among them (i. 13), combined with his declared unwillingness to build on another man's foundation (xv. 18–24), and with his boldness in admonishing them (xv. 15) by virtue of his Apostolic authority, forbids us to suppose that the Roman Church had been founded by any other Apostle.

We may however assume, almost with certainty, that the rise of the new faith in Jerusalem, and the great events by which it had been ushered in, must have been quickly known in Rome. Tacitus in fact expressly asserts this in his account of Nero's persecutions of the Christians, 'Annals' xv. 44: "The name was derived from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius suffered under Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judæa. By that event the sect of which he was the founder received a blow which for a time checked the growth of a dangerous superstition; but it revived *soon after*, and spread with recruited vigour not only in Judæa the soil which gave it birth, but even in the city of Rome, the common sink into which everything infamous and abominable flows like a torrent from all quarters of the world."

There was constant intercourse between the two great cities, and "some who had gone forth from Rome as Jews may well have returned thither as Christians" (Fritzsche). It is not improbable that some of the "*strangers of Rome*," i. e. Romans resident in Jerusalem, who witnessed the wonders of the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 10) may have been among the first to bring back the good tidings to the capital.

M. Godet ('Introduction,' p. 63) is unwilling to admit this explanation of the origin of the Church of Rome, as seeming to prove that the Gospel was spread in the city by means of the Synagogue. But the clear and positive statement of Tacitus, that Christianity *soon after* the death of its Founder spread even to the city of Rome, cannot be set aside for fear of any inferences that may be drawn from it.

Nor does it by any means follow that the Synagogue must have been the sole or chief channel through which a knowledge of the Gospel was diffused in Rome. If the first believers were Jews and Proselytes, to these there would soon be added Gentile Christians, who being either provincials had brought their new faith to Rome, or being Romans had learned it in the provinces; here a faithful centurion, and there a devout soldier of the Italian cohort, would bear witness at Rome of the things which he had seen and heard in Jerusalem.

Digitized by Google

The number of believers would rapidly increase: as the first teachers of the Gospel were driven forth by persecution, or by their own missionary zeal, beyond the bounds of Palestine (Acts viii. 1, 4; xi. 19; xii. 17; xiii. 3), every province that was traversed by an Apostle, every city in which a Christian church was founded, would help to swell the number of Christians drawn together in Rome from all parts of the empire.

But believers, few or many, scattered over a great city do not constitute a Church such as those which the Apostles founded. Did such a Church, duly organised, exist in Rome when St. Paul wrote this Epistle? No trace of such organisation is found either in the Epistle itself, or in the narrative of St. Paul's subsequent residence at Rome (Acts xxviii.).

If we put aside the circular letters, "Ephesians" and "Colossians," we find that in all St. Paul's Epistles addressed to Churches which are known to have been fully organised there is some mention of "the Church" (i. ii. Thess., i. ii. Cor., Gal.), or of "the Bishops and Deacons" (Phil. i. 1). But in "Romans" there is nothing of the kind, either in the address, or in the body of the letter, or in the final salutations.

The only "Church" mentioned is the little assembly in the house of Aquila and Priscilla (xvi. 5): the only reference to ecclesiastical ministers, teachers, or rulers is in xii., 4–8, a statement of the general principles of Church order, which proves the need rather than the existence of such an organisation in the Christian community at Rome as would secure the well-regulated exercise of individual gifts.

The whole tone of the exhortations in chapters xii., xiv., and especially in xii. 10, seems to imply a community of Christian brethren, in which none had yet been invested with superior authority.

The evidence thus furnished by the Epistle itself is too strong to be set aside by mere conjecture. We cannot agree with Meyer's opinion (p. 20, E. Tr.) that the existence of "a Church formally constituted may be gathered from the general analogy of other Churches that had already been long in existence:" much less with his further assumption, —"Especially may the existence of a body of Presbyters, which was essential to Church organisation (Acts xiv. 23), be regarded as a matter of course."

The formal organisation of a Church, and the existence of a body of Presbyters, can be inferred from the analogy of other Churches, only in a case where it is known that Apostolic authority has been exercised. Meyer himself thus writes (p. 22) concerning the Roman community at an earlier period: "Individual Christians were there, and certainly also Christian fellowship, but still no organised Church. To plant such a Church there was needed, as is plain from the analogy of all other cases of the founding of Churches with which we are acquainted, *official action* on the part of teachers *endowed directly or indirectly with Apostolic authority*."

Meyer evidently argues in a circle:

'Other Churches, namely those which had been founded by Apostles, were formally organised:

Therefore we infer, by analogy, that Rome was formally organised:

Therefore Rome must have been Apostolically founded.'

Setting aside such precarious inferences from an unproved analogy, we gather from the Epistle itself that the Christians at Rome were not as yet a Church fully and formally organised. Rather they were a large and "mixed community of Jew and Gentile converts," well described by Bishop Lightfoot ('Phil.' p. 13) as "a heterogeneous mass, with diverse feelings and sympathies, with no well-defined organisation, with no other bond of union than the belief in a common Messiah; gathering, we may suppose, for purposes of worship in small knots here and there, as close neighbourhood or common nationality or sympathy or accident drew them together; but, as a body, lost in the vast masses of the heathen population, and only faintly discerned or contemptuously ignored even by the large community of Jewish residents."

We may gather from the Epistle that

Digitized by Google

St. Paul had before his mind all the chief elements of this mixed community of Christians, as well as the unconverted Jews and heathens among whom they lived.

There were Jews of the Synagogue to whom the Gospel had not yet been preached, or by whom it had been long since rejected, and who appear three years later to have been still wrapped up in contemptuous ignorance of "this sect," which "is everywhere spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22). As in St. Luke's narrative the Apostle's first care within three days after his arrival in Rome is to call "the chief of the Jews together," and to expound unto them "the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus:" so in the Epistle he writes (i. 16), "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; *to the Jew first*, and also to the Greek."

Again when he writes, "Oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles: I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians" (i. 13, 14), it is clear that he hopes to preach the Gospel to Gentiles at Rome who had not yet heard it.

Within the Christian community itself there were many various sections: Jews of Palestine, some of whom, like Andronicus and Junias, Paul's kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, were of note among the Apostles in Jerusalem, and were also in Christ before Paul himself (xvi. 7): Jews of the Dispersion, like Aquila of Pontus and his wife Priscilla, Paul's chosen disciples and devoted friends: proselytes of Rome, now turned to Christ: Gentile Christians, of whom some, like the well-beloved Epænetus the first-fruits of Asia unto Christ (xvi. 5) had been St. Paul's own converts; others, like Amplias, Urban, Stachys, his helpers in Christ or friends beloved in the Lord; others again unknown by face, whom yet he salutes by name as "chosen in the Lord," or "approved in Christ," while of the great majority he only knew that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world.

## § 6. Occasion of Writing.

Dean Alford has justly observed that in answering the question, with what object was the Epistle written? critics have not sufficiently borne in mind that "*the occasion of writing* an Epistle is one thing,—*the great object* of the Epistle itself, another."

The distinction is in the present case most appropriate, for while the determination of the *main object* of the Epistle is one of the most disputed problems of modern criticism, the immediate *occasion of writing* is clearly stated by the Apostle himself. He had heard the faith of the Roman Christians everywhere spoken of (i. 8), and for many years had felt a longing desire to visit them (i. 11; xv. 23): he had often definitely purposed to do so (i. 13), and had been as often (τὰ πολλά, xv. 22) hindered.

A year before, when at Ephesus, he had purposed in the Spirit to go through Macedonia and Achaia, and thence to Jerusalem (Acts xix. 21), "*saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome.*" He had completed that portion of his journey which brought him nearest to Rome, and was now turning back from Corinth to the far East, going bound in the Spirit to Jerusalem, and already foreseeing that danger awaited him there from the unbelieving Jews (xv. 31).

He still longs and hopes to see Rome (i. 10), but already he is looking beyond it to the distant West: Rome is to be, as he hopes, a resting-place for brief sojourn on his way to Spain (xv. 24, 28).

The cause of this change or extension of his plan is not stated, but it probably sprang from the great conflict of the past year against Jews and Judaizing Christians, the records of which are his Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians. Hitherto he had preached the Gospel everywhere to the Jews first, but their general rejection of it was now an established fact (ix. 1; x. 3), over which he mourned, but in which he saw an intimation of God's will that he should now devote himself more exclusively to his own sphere of Apostolic labour, and go far off unto the Gentiles

Digitized by Google

His visit to Jerusalem with the alms of the Gentiles might be perhaps intended as a farewell token of his love (Gal. ii. 10). A considerable time must elapse before he could reach Rome, and then his stay must be short: an Epistle would be useful for the present needs of the brethren there, and by preparing the way for his personal ministration would render his short sojourn more profitable.

Phœbe, a servant or deaconess of the Church in Cenchreæ, had business to transact in Rome (xvi. 1), and to her charge the Epistle would naturally be entrusted.

### § 7. The Purpose of the Epistle.

In comparing the Epistle to the Romans with the Epistles addressed by St. Paul to other Churches, we perceive at once that it is distinguished from them all as containing a more general and systematic statement of Christian doctrine. It is quite natural that this most striking peculiarity should have been the first object of attention to any who were seeking to discover the chief aim and purpose of the writing.

In the Muratorian Fragment, which contains the earliest extant catalogue of the books of the New Testament, written about 170 A.D., the author thus describes the four greater Epistles of St. Paul: "First of all he wrote to the Corinthians forbidding party schism, next to the Galatians forbidding circumcision; but to the Romans he wrote at greater length concerning the plan of the Scriptures, showing at the same time that their foundation is Christ." (See Hilgenfeld, 'Einleitung in d. N. T.,' pp. 88–107; Routh, 'Rell. Sacr.' i. 394 sqq.; and Westcott on the Canon of the New Testament, p. 241.)

We observe that this earliest of Critics, while assigning to the Corinthian and Galatian letters special motives arising out of the particular circumstances of those Churches, attributes none but a perfectly general didactic purpose to the Epistle to the Romans.

*Origen*, in the preface to his Commentary, notices the difficulty of the Epistle, its indications of St. Paul's progress towards Christian perfection, and the time and place of writing; but *not the purpose.*

*Chrysostom* observes that St. Paul wrote to different Churches from different motives and on different subjects, and finds the motive of this Epistle in his desire to embrace the whole world in his ministry and to instruct the Romans, "*because* saith he, *of the grace that is given to me* of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ" (xv. 15).

*Theodoret* says that "the inspired Apostle offers in this letter varied doctrine of all kinds."

*Œcumenius*, after noticing the personal introduction (i. 1–15), says "for the rest he makes his Epistle didactic."

*Luther* says in his Preface to the Epistle, that it "contains in itself the plan of the whole Scripture, and is a most complete epitome of the New Testament or Gospel, which Gospel it exhibits in the briefest and clearest manner."

*Calvin* writes: "The whole Epistle is so systematic, that even the exordium itself is composed according to the rules of art." He then gives an outline of the contents, in which he regards "justification by faith as the principal question of the whole Epistle," and the destiny of Israel (ix.—xi.) as a subordinate subject.

The Epistle is described in like manner by *Melanchthon* as a "compendium of Christian doctrine," and by *Grotius* as "addressed specially to the Romans, but containing all the defences (munimenta) of the Christian religion, in such wise that it well deserved that copies should be sent to other Churches."

*Reiche* in his Commentary on the Epistle, p. 84, abides "by the view that the Epistle to the Romans is to be regarded according to its *material aim* as a universal, popular representation, adapted to the time, of the necessity, glory, and divine excellence of the Christian method of salvation, with reference to manifold objections especially of the old Theocracy, combined with a brief exhibition of genuine Christian feeling and conduct; but that its *formal aim* must be held to be

Digitized by Google

*establishment in Christian faith and Christian virtue.*"

*Tholuck* also, in his earlier editions, regards the design of the Epistle as "universal and *not founded on the peculiar circumstances of the Roman Church.*"

St. Paul, he thinks, undertakes an exposition of the entire scheme projected by the Divine Being for the salvation of mankind according as it is revealed to us in the Gospel; and afterwards, *as an appendage* to this, which is the larger portion of the letter, proceeds to the peculiar circumstances of the Church, so far as they were known to him.

Some of these statements are evidently exaggerated; but we must not on that account reject the truth which they contain. The Epistle does not "contain in itself a plan of the whole Scripture," nor is it "a complete epitome of the Gospel"; for there are whole provinces of revealed truth on which it scarcely touches. The range of its dogmatic teaching is rightly indicated in Melanchthon's question: "Is it not in reality on the Law, on Sin, and on Grace, that the knowledge of Christ depends?" And when Tholuck writes that St. Paul "wished to show how the Gospel, and the Gospel alone, fully answers to the soul's need of Salvation, a need which neither Paganism nor Judaism could satisfy," we can accept this representation as true in itself, but not as a complete or sufficient account of the whole purpose of the Epistle. It is, as all must admit, more didactic, methodical, and universal in its teaching than most of St. Paul's Epistles; and no statement of its purpose can be satisfactory which does not give full importance to this characteristic feature. Baur himself regards the Epistle "as a systematic work, dealing with a massive body of thought," and contrasts it with the Epistle to the Galatians, "the one being the first sketch of a bold and profound system as conceived in its characteristic and essential features, the other the completed system, developed on all sides, and provided with all necessary arguments and illustrations." ('Paul,' i. 309).

But this dogmatic system is not the only element that must be taken into consideration. What lies before us is not a manual of Christian doctrine nor a theological treatise, but a letter; and it is of the very essence of a letter that it arises out of special relations between the writer and his readers, by which its purpose is in great measure determined. In regard to this Epistle it has been too lightly assumed that a special motive is inconsistent with a general didactic purpose.

"The question," writes M. Godet, "stands thus If we assign a special practical aim to the Epistle, we put ourselves, as it seems, in contradiction to the very general and quasi-systematic character of its contents. If on the contrary we ascribe to it a didactic and wholly general aim, it differs thereby from the other letters of St. Paul, all of which spring from some particular occasion, and have a definite aim." (i. p. 80).

We cannot regard this as a correct statement of the case: the supposed dilemma is purely fictitious. There is no necessary or natural opposition between a more general and a more special purpose: the two become opposed only when it is arbitrarily assumed that either of them is the complete and exclusive purpose; and to suggest an opposition which has no real existence is only to create an imaginary difficulty for the sake of refuting it.

The real difficulty lies not in the co-existence of a general and a special purpose, but in determining the exact nature of each, their respective limits and mutual relations.

We pass on then to consider the views of other interpreters who have endeavoured to discover the special circumstances which influenced the Apostle in writing this Epistle, in other words to determine its historical origin and purpose. We have seen already in § 5 that the Christians at Rome must have formed a community of diverse elements drawn from various nations and creeds, in which we may well believe that every variety of Christian thought and feeling found a place. We have

Digitized by Google

also seen that in comparison with St. Paul's other letters "the great character of the Epistle is its universality" (Bishop Wordsworth).

But this very character of universality, both in the letter and in the Community to which it is addressed, makes it more than usually difficult to determine the mutual relations of the different classes of Christians at Rome, and the special motive and purpose of the letter.

Another circumstance which adds to this difficulty is that St. Paul had not yet been at Rome, and consequently we have none of those life-like pictures and graphic strokes which set so vividly before our eyes the inner life of those Churches to which his earlier Epistles were addressed, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Galatia.

In such circumstances speculation has free scope, and theories are more easily formed than refuted. By exaggerating some features and disregarding others, it is easy to give an air of plausibility to very different views of the prevailing tendencies of thought and practice in the Christian Community at Rome, and of the corresponding purpose of the Epistle.

There is however one historical circumstance to which a primary importance is almost universally conceded. The great religious difficulty of the time was unquestionably "the relation of Judaism and Heathenism to each other, and of both to Christianity" (Baur, 'Paulus' i. 316), and more especially the fact that contrary, as it seemed, to God's promises, His chosen people were superseded by Gentiles (p. 317). No one can read the sections i. 18—iv. and ix.—xi., without perceiving that they have this as their common subject, treated in different ways.

Olshausen, of whom Baur speaks as exhibiting "the extreme point of the purely dogmatic view" (p. 312) finds in the Epistle to the Romans a purely objective statement of the nature of the Gospel, "*grounded only on the general opposition between Jews and Gentiles*, and not on a more special opposition in the Church itself between Judaizing and non-Judaizing Christians" ('Commentary,' p. 47).

This view, which is very similar to De Wette's, seems to err in insisting that the general question of the opposite relations of Jew and Gentile to the Gospel is the *only* historical ground of the Epistle, and in allowing even to this too little influence upon its main purpose.

Baur, by whom their views are keenly criticised, puts forward an entirely different theory, in support of which he is obliged "to advance a view of the *occasion* and *purpose* of writing the Epistle, which is radically different from the common one" ('Paul,' i. 310).

Although Baur's theory has not been accepted even by his own followers without great and essential modifications, it has formed the starting point of nearly all subsequent treatment of the subject, and must therefore be at least briefly examined.

(1) The three chapters ix.—xi. are "the germ and centre of the whole, from which the other parts sprang; and we should take our stand on these three chapters in order to enter into the Apostle's original conception, from which the whole organism of the Epistle was developed, as we have it especially in the first eight chapters. For this purpose we have first to examine the contents of chapters ix.—xi."

This assumption is by no means self-evident. At first sight it would appear at least more probable that to trace out the Apostle's line of thought correctly we should follow the order in which he has himself presented it: and if, in order to understand his discussion in i. 17—viii. 39, any indication of the occasion and purpose of his writing is necessary, it must certainly be right to seek that preliminary indication in i. 8–16, rather than in ix.—xi.

It is obvious also that by this mode of interpretation Baur, the professed champion of historical criticism, has justly incurred the charge brought against him by Schott (p. 4), that he has entirely ignored the historical method, and constructed the history out of his own dogmatic interpretation.

(2) The contents of ix.—xi. having been briefly and fairly stated, Baur rightly

Digitized by Google

concludes that the subject treated by the Apostle "is both the relation of Judaism and heathenism to each other, and the relation of both to Christianity" (p. 316). He adds, "It certainly appears that he cannot have devoted so large a part of his Epistle to answering this question without some *special outward reason* prompting him to do so, such as may have arisen out of the circumstances of the Church *at Rome*."

The words which we have emphasized mark, as we believe, the prime fallacy of Baur's theory. He confuses the *occasion* of the letter with its *main object:* he seeks a *special* and *local cause*, when a *general* one is needed: he fails to distinguish a reason for *addressing the letter to Rome*, from the reason for writing a full and systematic discussion of a great question by which *the whole Christian Church was at that time agitated*, and which was and ever must be of the deepest interest to all Christians alike.

(3) The error in principle, which we have just noticed, leads to an ill-founded and, as we believe, mistaken view of the actual condition and circumstances of the Christian Community at Rome.

"I think," he writes (i. 331), "we are entitled to take it for granted that the section of the Roman Church to which the Epistle is addressed must have been the preponderating element in the Church; and if this be so, then the Church consisted mainly of Jewish Christians."

This being a point of chief importance not only in estimating Baur's theory, but in forming any correct view of the purpose of the Epistle, we must briefly examine the evidence which bears upon it.

In i. 2, 3 Baur thinks that "Old Testament ideas are studiously introduced, which show that the Apostle had Jewish-Christian readers in his eye when he addressed himself to the composition of the Epistle."

That a portion of St. Paul's readers were Jewish Christians is admitted by all on much surer evidence than is contained in these verses: but if the introduction of Old Testament ideas is supposed to prove that the Jewish Christians were the preponderating element, it might as well be argued, on the same ground, that the Churches of Corinth and Galatia must have consisted mainly of Jewish Christians.

The meaning of the passage i. 5, 6 (ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) is keenly discussed.

It is claimed on the one side as proving decisively that the majority of the readers addressed were Jewish Christians.

"In respect of the Jewish Christians, he speaks of the universality of his calling; it extended to all nations alike, and the Jewish Christians of Rome were not beyond its scope. In order to meet the objection that he was an Apostle of the Gentiles and had nothing to do with Jewish Christians, he speaks of the Jews as one people under the general term of the ἔθνη (the nations). He shows his credentials with regard to the Jewish Christians, to justify the Epistle which he is going to write" (Baur, 'Paul,' i. p. 333).

Volkmar ('Paulus Römerbrief,' p. 141) supports the same view:

"1–14. I seem indeed to be merely a Gentile-Apostle, but through the Christ have I been called to bring non-Gentile Christians (Messianer) also to the religious obedience which consists in faith in Christ, and thereby to help towards the establishment of peace even in a Church which is a stranger to peace."

This view, untenable as it really is, has unfortunately been attacked on the wrong points.

The rendering "*among all nations*," which is that of our A.V., is not only admissible, but in this context even preferable to that which is proposed instead of it,—"among all the Gentiles." See the note on the passage. Those who, like M. Godet, would affix to the words "a definite, restricted, and quasi-technical sense, *the nations* in opposition *to the* chosen *people*," seem to forget that they themselves acknowledge that there were some Jewish Christians among the readers addressed. Which meaning then

Digitized by Google

of the word "*nations*" is most suitable to the opening address, the natural meaning which includes all the readers without distinction, or the technical meaning which pointedly excludes a portion of them?

An impartial student, who has no *à priori* theory to support, will be disposed to admit that, in a letter addressed to a mixed community of Jewish and Gentile Christians, St. Paul could not possibly mean to exclude any by words which might be so understood as to include them all.

This comprehensive sense of the words "*among all nations*" is confirmed by the true meaning of *v.* 6, "*Among whom are ye also [the] called of Jesus Christ.*" Neither Baur nor his critics have seen the true connexion between this and the preceding verse. For while it would be superfluous to inform Gentiles *as such* that they were included "among all the Gentiles" (Godet), and equally superfluous to inform Jewish Christians that they *as Jews* were included "among all the nations" (Baur), it is neither superfluous nor irrelevant to remind both Jewish and Gentile Christians that their being already "*called of Jesus Christ*" is an *actual* proof that they are included in the commission of one who had received through Jesus Christ Himself "*grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations.*"

The great mass of the Gentile world was not as yet so called: the great mass of the Jews had rejected the calling. Thus the Apostle gracefully acknowledges the position of privilege which his readers had already attained, and turns it into a proof of his right to address them.

This meaning of *v.* 6 is well expressed by M. Reuss: "et vous aussi, vous vous trouvez dans ce nombre comme appelés de Jésus-Christ."

Another much disputed passage is i. 13, 14, "*that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles,*" where the last words are better rendered "*as among* **the rest of the** *Gentiles.*"

Here also Baur and Volkmar (p. 73) assume that ἔθνεσιν means simply "nations," and draw the conclusion that St. Paul "speaks of the Jews as one people under the general term ἔθνη." But we have not here the same emphatic universality which in *v.* 5 demands the comprehensive sense "*all nations.*"

Even if we admit that here also ἔθνη may mean simply "nations" without reference to the distinction between Jew and Gentile, we are still far from the conclusion that the Apostle has any thought in his mind of the Jews as a nation, or of Christians at Rome as Jewish Christians. For the antithesis must then have been "among you (Jews), as among the rest of the nations": whereas now it is clearly this—"among you (Romans), as among the rest of the nations." Even with this sense of ἔθνη therefore, the readers are regarded not as Jewish Christians, but simply as Romans.

However, we cannot but agree with the great majority of both ancient and modern interpreters (including among the latter Meyer, Reuss, Weizsäcker, Godet, Davidson) that this passage, *v.* 13, distinctly proves the Christian Community at Rome to have consisted mainly of Gentiles. See note on the verse.

In connexion with these two passages and the introduction of which they form part (i. 1–15), we must notice another mistake into which many writers have fallen in the eagerness of their opposition to Baur and his school. According to these latter, St. Paul wishes "to meet the objection that he was an Apostle of the Gentiles and had nothing to do with Jewish Christians" (Baur, 'Paul,' p. 333).

"Paul the Apostle of the Messiah Jesus wishes grace and peace to the Church of God in the capital of the World! I seem indeed to you to be merely an Apostle of the Greeks, but I am called by God Himself through Jesus Christ, to preach the Gospel of God's Son in the Spirit to *all* nations, even Non-Hellenes, as ye Mosaic followers of Messiah for the most part are" (Volkmar, p. 1; compare p. 141).

"Moreover he brings forward in new forms of speech the universality of his office as an Apostle for the obedience of

Digitized by Google

faith among all nations. For he, who at first had grounded his Apostolic claim upon the fact that he was called by God to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, as Peter to be the Apostle of the Jews (Gal. ii. 7), could now win the right to send a letter of Apostolic preaching to the Jewish Christians at Rome only in such a form by bringing prominently forward the universality of his commission" (Holsten, "Der Gedankengang des Römerbriefs," in the 'Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie,' 1879, No. 1, p. 101).

This representation of St. Paul as having been hitherto exclusively an Apostle of the Gentiles has been too lightly accepted by those who seek to draw from it an exactly opposite conclusion. It will be sufficient to quote as an example of this view the words of Weizsäcker in his excellent article "Upon the earliest Christian Church at Rome" in the 'Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie,' 1876, Part ii. p. 250: "Here it is not a question of the interpretation of the word (ἔθνη) in itself merely. He appeals to his own proper Apostolic mission, consequently to his Gentile Apostlesihp. By that alone the meaning is at once decided beyond question. St. Paul could not possibly express himself as he does in this introduction to the Epistle. if the Christians at Rome were even but for the more part a Jewish Christian Church. They belong to him because he is a *Gentile Apostle. As such he has not to do with the circumcised*, as is shown by his conversation with Peter, Gal. ii. 7, 8."

We may confidently say that St. Paul never took so limited and narrow a view of his Apostleship as is implied in the words which we have printed in italics. When he says that through Jesus Christ he "received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations" (*v.* 5), he is certainly not thinking of the arrangement made with St. Peter (Gal. ii. 7–9), but of that Apostleship which was "*not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead*" (Gal. i. 1), of that voice which had said to Ananias, "*Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel*" (Acts ix. 15), and of the words of Ananias himself "*Thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard*" (Acts xxii. 15).

It is true that each Apostle chose for his missionary labours a special field, one going *unto the heathen*, another *unto the circumcision* (Gal. ii. 9); but as Apostles they all dealt with all members of the Churches, irrespective of their race, knowing that "*in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile*" (Gal. iii. 28).

To imagine St. Paul implying that because he was an Apostle of the Gentiles he had as such nothing to do with the Jews, is to impute to him a thought of which he was incapable, and one which is directly opposed to his own statements in various passages of this Epistle, such as i. 16, ii. 9, iii. 19. The error has in fact arisen from the very general misinterpretation of his words in xi. 13, which distinctly imply that he was *not* an Apostle of the Gentiles *only*, but that this was *one part* (μέν), though doubtless the chief part, of his office: see our note on the passage, and Introduction to 1 Peter, § 3, note 3.

This same passage xi. 13 is misinterpreted in another respect by Baur, p. 332.

"The very fact that when the Apostle turns to the Gentile Christians, he makes it appear that he does so, and addresses them specially (xi. 13–24) shows that in the rest of the Epistle he had Jewish much more than Gentile Christians before his mind. The main argument being concluded, they are singled out as a part of the community, they are addressed specially (ὑμῖν γὰρ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, xi. 13), and thus appear as subordinate to the general body, in addressing which no special designation is required."

This bold stroke of interpretation will not bear examination.

In the first place there is no turning from a general body of readers to a portion specially singled out. The words ὑμῖν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν do not mean, as Baur supposes "you the Gentile part of my readers," but "you my readers

Digitized by Google

who are Gentiles": see our note on the passage, and compare Green, 'Grammar of the N. T. Dialect,' p. 199.

Throughout the whole section, ix.—xi., though so deeply interesting to every Jew, there is not the slightest indication that St. Paul "had Jewish more than Gentile Christians before his mind," as Baur asserts. Only once before in this section are the readers described, and then simply, as "brethren" (x. i.): they are distinguished throughout from the Jews, of whom he speaks "as third persons" (Meyer). He calls them "*my* brethren, *my* kinsmen according to the flesh," not "*our* brethren, *our* kinsmen," as would be natural if his readers were for the most part Jews.

Baur himself writes: "The whole section which concludes this part of the Epistle, xi. 13–36, is certainly devoted to the Gentile Christians: this is shewn by the repeated ὑμεῖς in *vv.* 28, 30, 31, and by the drift of the passage *vv.* 15–29, when correctly understood. But this section is of the nature of a digression, and the argument then returns to its proper object" (p. 333). This concession is fatal: for no one who has impartially studied the train of thought in ix.—xi. and the close connexion between ch. xi. and xii. 1, will be easily persuaded that xii. 13–36 is a mere digression or anything less than the grand conclusion of the whole argument upon the destiny of Israel, nor will believe that the readers addressed in the repeated ὑμεῖς in *vv.* 28, 30, 31 are only a small Gentile fraction of the whole body to whom the Apostle says in xii. 1, "*I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God*": see the notes there.

Having now examined all the passages specially alleged by Baur as proving that the readers were for the most part Jewish Christians, we must notice more briefly a few other passages which may be supposed to support the same view.

In ii. 17–39 it is too obvious to need more than a passing remark that the Jew so sternly and sarcastically addressed cannot possibly be thought of as one of the readers; nor is there any need to dwell on Volkmar's strange notion that the passage iii. 1–8 "is a dialogue between the Jew *in* the Jewish Christian and the man who is slandered as wishing to overthrow the Law that through this evil good may come."

In iv. 1, Abraham is called "*our father*," or "*our* **forefather**." Does the pronoun "*our*" imply, as is alleged, the Jewish origin of the Christians of Rome? "Yes," replies M. Godet, "if the translation were: *our father according to the flesh*."

M. Godet accordingly has recourse to the forced and unsuitable connexion, "What shall we say that Abraham hath found according to the flesh?"—and gives to προπάτορα the sense of "spiritual forefather." There is however nothing in the *immediate* context to justify such an anticipation of the *spiritual* fatherhood of Abraham, which first comes into notice in *v.* 11; and without such anticipation the supposed difficulty is not removed by the change of construction.

The very simple explanation is that the question is naturally put from the standing-point of a Jew, whether St. Paul himself or an imaginary objector is of no consequence. What else then could he say than "*our*" forefather? Speaking to Gentiles concerning the Jews in general, a Jew would say, as St. Paul says in ix. 3, "*my* brethren, *my* kinsmen according to the flesh"; but in speaking of Abraham, or of Isaac, as in ix. 16, no one Jew could separate himself from his nation and say "*my* forefather Abraham," or "*my* father Isaac."

Weizsäcker (*ib.* p. 259) puts the question rightly: "In 1 Cor. x. 1 Paul speaks of the Israelites in the wilderness, and there calls them quite in the same way '*all our fathers*.' But who would thence wish to conclude, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, that the Corinthian Church was an especially Jewish Christian one?" See our foot-note and additional note on iv. 1.

In vii. 1 the Apostle writes "*Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law) &c.*" and the parenthesis is supposed to point to Jewish readers. But Meyer's answer is complete: "Looking to the close connexion subsisting

Digitized by Google

between the Jewish and Gentile-Christian portions of the Church, to the custom borrowed from the Synagogue of reading from the Old Testament in public, and to the necessary and essential relations which Evangelical instruction and preaching sustained to the O. T., so that the latter was the basis from which they started, the Apostle might designate *his readers generally* as γινώσκοντες [τὸν] νόμον, and predicate of them an acquaintance with the Law." This strong argument becomes even stronger, when for the A. V. we substitute the more correct rendering required by the absence of the Article before γινώσκουσιν and νόμον: see foot-note on the verse.

We may add that in the case of born Jews a knowledge of the Law would have been too much a matter of course to require this special mention, which is on the other hand perfectly natural in the case of Gentile converts who had not always known the law. Thus in Galatians iv. 21, St. Paul asks, "*Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?*" Yet who would infer from this that the Galatian Churches were of Jewish origin?

Volkmar indeed ventures to say (p. xi.) that in Rom. vii. 1 "born Hebrews are directly addressed, as the root-stem of the Church": but we may confidently reply, with Weizsäcker (p. 259) that "If anyone will lay stress upon this expression, it speaks much more in favour of Gentile than of Jewish readers."

The passage xv. 14–16 is usually and justly regarded as a clear proof that the readers addressed were for the most part Gentiles. Dr. Davidson does not admit this ('Introduction to N. T.' i. 125): "Here Paul announces himself the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable to God. But the context does not necessarily limit the *offering of the Gentiles* to that of the *Roman Christians*, as is assumed." This objection is quite beside the mark: it is not assumed at all that the offering is limited to *Roman* Christians: but it is manifest that St. Paul justifies himself for writing boldly to the Romans on the ground that he is a minister of Christ to the Gentiles. The conclusion is inevitable, that the readers thus addressed were Gentiles.

This passage is treated in a different way by the Tübingen critics, who represent it as an addition made by one of the Pauline party at a later period to remove or soften "the bad impression" made by the genuine Epistle upon a Jewish Christian Church which was already gaining pre-eminence over other Churches, and claiming another Apostle, St. Peter, as its founder. See Baur, 'Paulus,' pp. 355, 365. Apart, however, from this passage we have found abundant evidence in that portion of the Epistle of which the genuineness has not been questioned, to prove that the majority of the Christians at Rome, when St. Paul wrote to them, were not of Jewish but of Gentile origin: and herewith we have removed the corner-stone of Baur's own theory and many subsequent modifications of it.

Without dwelling on these various theories, we proceed to consider the several historical circumstances, which tend to throw light on the purpose of the Epistle.

In doing this we cannot limit our view, as Baur has done (p. 310), to the special circumstances and doctrinal tendencies of the readers addressed. We must look also to the position of St. Paul himself at this time in relation to Rome, to Jerusalem, to the Gentile Churches, to the whole course of his Apostolic work, and to the great questions which were at that time most intimately connected with the truth of the Gospel which he preached.

(*a*). It is universally admitted that there were both Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Roman Community. From evidence furnished by the Epistle we have concluded that the Jewish element was not predominant. Bp. Lightfoot, who at one time admitted "the existence of a large, perhaps preponderant, Jewish element in the Church of the Metropolis before St. Paul's arrival" ('Philippians' p. 17), seems to withdraw this opinion in a subsequent essay in the 'Journal of Philology,' 1869,

Digitized by Google

No. 4, p. 228: "St. Paul, if I mistake not, starts from the fact that the Roman Church stood on Gentile ground, and that very large and perhaps preponderating numbers of its members were Gentiles. This is his justification for writing to them, as the Apostle of the Gentiles. It never once occurs to him that he is intruding on the province of others."

If the majority of the Roman Christians were, as we believe, of Gentile origin, it may still be thought that they had been subject for the most part to Judaizing influences, and were strongly prejudiced against St. Paul. "M. Renan insists that the Roman brotherhood must have been founded and built up by emissaries from Palestine. But why should the Christianity of Rome be due to Jerusalem solely, and not also to Antioch and Corinth and Ephesus, with which cities communication must have been even more frequent? Why at Rome alone should the Judaic element be all-powerful and the Pauline insignificant?" (Bp. Lightfoot, 'Journal of Philology,' p. 289.)

There is in the whole Epistle only one short reference to false teachers (xvi. 17–20), and in this, if the persons meant were, as is assumed and that with great probability, Judaizing adversaries of St. Paul, we have a distinct proof, that the teaching hitherto prevalent in the community was not Judaistic but the contrary, in the words "*mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.*" In our notes on the passage we follow the usual supposition that it was written, like the rest of the Epistle, *before St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome:* but see the concluding paragraphs of § 8.

Bleek has treated this point with great clearness and moderation in his 'Introduction to the N. T.,' i. 442: "The probability is that it (Christianity) was not conveyed thither by any special or prominent teachers or missionaries sent for the purpose, but that residents in the city, Jews and Gentiles, became acquainted with it and were converted elsewhere, and upon their return made converts among their friends. This may have been the case especially with many Jews who either were driven from Rome by the edict of Claudius, and when this edict was forgotten or revoked, returned again, or went to reside there for the first time. They may have been converted to Christianity *partly* by St. Paul's preaching, or by that of his companions or in some of the Churches planted by him, and *partly* in other places, *e. g.* in Jerusalem itself."

We know beyond doubt that differences of belief and practice existed in Rome as in other Churches. One class would not eat flesh nor drink wine (xiv. 2, 21) lest they should be defiled (*v.* 14), and also observed certain days as more holy than others (*v.* 5); while another class regarded all kinds of food, and all days, alike. These were inclined to despise the former as superstitious, the former to condemn them as profane (*vv.* 3, 10). Bp. Lightfoot thinks that the asceticism here described may possibly be due to Essene influences ('Colossians,' p. 169), while Baur asserts that the characteristics "are such as are found nowhere else but with the Ebionites." The rigid observance of the Sabbath and other holy days, and extreme simplicity in eating and drinking, were common to both Essenes and Ebionites. Baur confesses that there is no express statement that the Ebionites abstained from wine.

Of the Essenes Josephus ('Bell. Jud.' ii. 8, 5) thus writes: "When they have taken their seats quietly, the baker sets loaves before them in order, and the cook sets one dish of one kind of food before each." The word "food" (ἔδεσμα, 'pulmentum') does not exclude flesh (Plato, 'Timæus,' 73, A), and there is no mention of abstinence from wine either here, or as we believe in any of the other notices of the Essenes by Josephus ('Vita,' 2; 'Ant.' xiii. 5, 9, xviii. 1, 5), or by Philo Judaeus ('Quod omnis probus liber,' xii., xiii.; Fragm. apud Euseb. 'Praepar. Evang.' viii. 8).

There is however a description of the Therapeutae, a Jewish sect whom Philo distinguishes from the Essenes ('Vita Contempl.' iv.), which combines all the characteristic scruples mentioned by St. Paul: "They eat nothing of a costly



Digitized by Google

character, but plain bread and a seasoning of salt, which the more luxurious of them do further season with hyssop: and their drink is water from the spring."

In another passage (ib. ix.) he says, in describing their feasts, "wine is not introduced, but only the clearest water; cold water for the generality, and hot water for those old men who are accustomed to a luxurious life. And the table too bears nothing which has blood, but there is placed upon it bread for food and salt for seasoning, to which also hyssop is sometimes added as an extra sauce for the sake of those who are delicate in their eating."

These Therapeutae were numerous in Egypt, but were also met with in various places, in Greece and in the country of the Barbarians (*ib.* iii.).

It is thus quite clear from contemporary evidence that ascetic practices, such as St. Paul describes, were in his time common among the religious Jews, and not unlikely to be adopted by Jewish Christians: while from the tone in which St. Paul speaks of these brethren weak in faith, we may safely infer that they, *i. e.* the Jewish Christians, were a minority both in numbers and influence, whose conscientious scruples should be treated with kindness and forbearance. They did not put themselves forward "in an aggressive anti-Pauline attitude: they were men not of hostile, but only of prejudiced minds, whose moral consciousness lacked the vigour to regard a peculiar asceticism as unessential" (Meyer).

In the desire to abate the dissension between these two classes, we see a sufficient motive for one portion of the Epistle (xiv.—xv. 13), but no sufficient ground for the great doctrinal argument which precedes (i. 18—xi.). In other words *the main purpose* of the Epistle is neither a polemic against Jewish Christians nor an attempt to reconcile Jewish and Gentile believers, occasioned by the local circumstances and special tendencies of the Christian Community at Rome.

(*b.*) Another important point in reference to the motive of the Epistle is St. Paul's own position at this time with regard to Rome and other Gentile Churches.

His earnest desire to visit Rome (i. 10–15, xv. 22–24) formed part of a great plan of carrying the Gospel into the distant regions of the West. It is acknowledged even by those who doubt the authenticity of Rom. xv. that the design here mentioned may well have been entertained by the Apostle, and that the mention of it is in fact an argument for the genuineness of the passage. There is no historical evidence (unless it be the much disputed and doubtful phrase. ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών in the Epistle of Clement of Rome, 'Cor.' v.) that St. Paul ever visited Spain: and though it is not at all improbable that he may have entertained a purpose which he was never able to accomplish, it is in the highest degree incredible that a forger should think of *inventing* for him a design which did not correspond with any known event in his life. Compare Baur ('Paulus,' p. 180), Lucht (p. 192) Hilgenfeld (p. 486).

In this design then we find one chief cause of the Apostle's earnest desire to visit Rome. His work in the East, so far as it required his personal presence, was accomplished: he had preached the Gospel "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum." Jerusalem itself, Damascus, Caesarea, Tarsus, "the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Acts ix. 19–30; Gal. i. 21; ii. 1, 2) are all naturally included in the general phrase which describes the extent of his early labours in the East, "*Jerusalem and round about.*" Quite recently he had paid a second visit to Macedonia and "*had gone over those parts*" (Acts xx. 2), passing so far to the West as to reach Illyricum, which borders upon Macedonia (Paley's 'Horae Paulinae,' Ch. ii. No. 4).

Never before had he been so near to Rome, and now that his mind was full of the great design of carrying the Gospel beyond Rome itself into those far regions of Western Europe, where Christ was not yet named (xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16), he had the strongest motives for forming more intimate relations with the Christians at Rome,

Digitized by Google

motives quite independent of the internal condition of their Community. His keen eye could not but discern the vast importance of securing a base of operations in the Capital of the Western World. Hence in part his fervent desire to visit Rome, hence also a motive for writing this Epistle in order to secure at once the sympathy and help of his brethren there. We may admit with Bleek (p. 445) that St. Paul "discerned the great importance of the Church in such a centre, and of the tendencies which it adopted, as influencing the Church of Christ at large, and how desirable it was that the Christians there should not be disturbed and rent asunder by internal disputes and party strifes." It was natural that the Apostle, being unable at once to visit Rome, should gladly take an opportunity of sending by Phœbe "a letter containing his Apostolic instructions and exhortations" (Bleek). The reality of this motive cannot be doubted, though its importance may be exaggerated: it accounts for St. Paul's writing to Rome, though not for his writing so remarkable an Epistle: we cannot, with Schott, find here the key to unlock the whole meaning and purpose of the Epistle.

(*c.*) Another historical circumstance mentioned in the Epistle is St. Paul's intended journey to Jerusalem: when this intention is first announced at Ephesus (Acts xix. 21) it is connected with the desire to visit Rome. What then was the motive which urged the Apostle, in spite of warnings and prophecies and his own forebodings of danger (Acts xx. 22, 23, 28; xxi. 4, 11–14), to persist in his resolution to go up to Jerusalem? It was evidently the desire to vindicate himself against the calumnies of the Judaizing adversaries who had so maliciously assailed his character, denied his Apostolic authority, and hindered his work in the Churches of Corinth and Galatia. These adversaries were not Jewish Christians of the ordinary type, much less were they the authorised agents of the original Apostles: they were the same bigoted and uncompromising partisans of the circumcision, of whom we read at an earlier period (Acts xi. 2, 3) that they contended with Peter, "*saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them.*" And was there not cause for St. Paul to fear that these bitter enemies would stir up strife in Rome and try to frustrate his labour in the West, as they had already in the East? This fear would be most naturally suggested by the Apostle's very recent experience at Corinth. There he had won a hard victory over those "overgreat Apostles" (2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11) who were nothing else than "*false Apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into (the) Apostles of Christ*" (2 Cor. xi. 13): their slanders had reached the ears of the many thousands of Jewish believers in Jerusalem: they might even raise a prejudice against him in the minds of the true Apostles, and of James and the elders of the Church. His personal presence and report of what "*God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry,*" supported by the testimony of the faithful brethren who accompanied him, and by the substantial proof which they carried with them of the goodwill of the Gentile Churches towards the poor Saints at Jerusalem, would remove the unjust suspicions of Jewish converts assembled from all parts for the feast at Jerusalem, and win fresh confidence and sympathy for the Apostle himself in entering upon his new sphere of missionary work in Western Europe. If such were the Apostle's motives for undertaking the perilous journey to Jerusalem, it can hardly be doubted that this Epistle, written at the same time, was due, in part at least, to the same desire to repel the false accusations of Judaizing opponents, to conciliate the goodwill of Jewish Christians in general, and to promote in Rome and elsewhere a closer union between Jewish and Gentile believers.

(*d.*) But when we examine the record of St. Paul's life at this period, we find that his most dangerous and deadly enemies were not Jewish Christians, nor even Judaizing teachers, but *unbelieving Jews.*

In the terrible catalogue of sufferings written a few months before his Epistle



Digitized by Google

to the Romans, he tells of perils *by his own countrymen*, as well as by Heathen and false brethren; he tells also how *of the Jews* five times he had received forty stripes save one (2 Cor. xi.). If we turn to St. Luke's narrative we find the Apostle in Ephesus sparing no effort, shrinking from no danger, in preaching to *his brethren according to the flesh* and "persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God." Driven after three months from the Synagogue in which, as Dr. Farrar ingeniously conjectures, some of those five scourgings had been patiently endured, he still continued by the space of two years preaching *both to Jews and Greeks* the word of the Lord Jesus (Acts xix. 8–10).

Again, within a few weeks after writing to the Romans, he reminds the Ephesian elders at Miletus of temptations which, as they knew, had befallen him "*by the lying in wait of the Jews.*" In Jerusalem itself the "*bonds and afflictions*" which awaited him (xx. 23) came, as had been foreseen, not from Judaizing Christians but from fanatic "*Jews which were of Asia*" (xxi. 11, 27).

It is evident that dissensions within the Churches between Jewish and Gentile Christians were but a faint reflection of the bitter and unceasing enmity with which St. Paul was pursued by the unbelieving Jews: and thus it is in the great conflict between "*the Jews' religion*" and the Gospel of Christ, that we find the true cause and purpose of that great doctrinal treatise (i. 18—xi.), which forms the main subject of the Epistle, well described by Baur as "the relation of Judaism and Heathenism to each other, and of both to Christianity."

If then we remember the distinction formerly noticed between the *occasion* of writing, and the main *purpose* of the Epistle, the former may be referred to the personal circumstances of the Apostle, and his relation to the Christian Community at Rome; while in the local circumstances and special tendencies of that community we may discover both the *occasion* and *purpose* of certain subordinate portions of the letter (i. 1–16, xii.—xv;) but as the *main purpose of the whole Epistle* we can acknowledge nothing less comprehensive than the desire of the Apostle, at a momentous crisis in his own life's work and in the history of the whole Church of Christ, to set forth a full and systematic statement of those fundamental principles of the Gospel, which render it the one true religion for all the nations of the earth, and meet especially those deepest wants of human nature, which Judaism could not satisfy, righteousness in the sight of God, and deliverance from the power of sin and death.

In chapters ix.—xi. we have no mere historical appendix or corollary, but an intensely earnest and practical application of the principles previously discussed to the great religious difficulty of the time, the rejection of the Gospel by the mass of the Jewish nation, and the acceptance of the Gentiles in their place as the chosen people of God.

## § 8. Integrity of the Epistle.

Under this head we have to consider two questions which depend in part on the same evidence: Is the doxology (xvi. 25–27) genuine? Do chapters xv. and xvi. belong wholly, or in part, or not at all to this Epistle?

The origin and nature of these questions will be best explained, if we begin with the testimony of the early fathers.

I. Tertullian, writing A.D. 207–210 against Marcion's "*Antitheses*," or Contradictions between the Old and New Testaments, says (*adv. Marc.* v. 13): "What great gaps Marcion made especially in this Epistle (to the Romans) by expunging whatever he would, will be clear from the unmutilated text of our own copy. Some passages however, which ought according to his plan to have been expunged, he overlooked: and it is enough for my purpose to accept these as instances of his negligence and blindness."

In his subsequent argument Tertullian quotes no passage from chapters xv.—xvi., and refers to xiv. 10–13 as being at the close of the Epistle ("in

Digitized by Google

clausulâ"): but as he uses only such passages as Marcion had retained, this only tends to prove that the last chapters were wanting, not in his own copy, but in Marcion's.

In the treatise on Baptism, ch. xvii., Tertullian refers to the 'Acts of Paul and Thecla': now in that fiction there is frequent mention of a certain Tryphaena, who though living at Antioch in Syria is evidently connected with Rome, being called the kinswoman of Cæsar. There can be little doubt that this name Tryphaena has been taken, like other names in the same work, Onesiphorus, Demas, and Hermogenes, from St. Paul's Epistles. Hence it follows that Rom. xvi. was known, if not to Tertullian himself, at least to an earlier writer whom he quotes.

It must however be admitted that in Tertullian's other works no clear reference to these chapters has been found, though all the other chapters are frequently quoted.

The case is the same with IRENÆUS and CYPRIAN, except that Cyprian fails also to quote from Rom. iv.

But this argument from silence is worthless, as may be easily shown from the parallel case of 1 Cor. xvi.

Cyprian quotes from every other chapter, about 101 times in all; Irenæus quotes every other chapter except xiv., about seventy-seven times in all: yet neither Irenæus nor Cyprian appears to have ever quoted 1 Cor. xvi. Tertullian, in his work against Marcion, quotes every other chapter of 1 Cor., 129 times in all, yet never refers to ch. xvi.: in his other works there are more than 300 quotations from the Epistle, including every chapter except xvi., from which there is possibly one quotation, though we have failed to verify Tischendorf's reference 'Pudicitia,' 14.

When therefore Lucht concludes from this silence that it is *possible* that Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenæus had no knowledge of Rom. xv., xvi., we may reply, It is equally *possible* and neither more nor less *probable*, as far as this silence is concerned, that the same fathers had no knowledge of 1 Cor. xvi.

A more *probable* explanation is that Irenæus and Cyprian, using only such passages as suited their own immediate purpose, like Tertullian in his treatise against Marcion, found no occasion to refer to Rom. xv., xvi. In fact these chapters, like 1 Cor. xvi., are in great measure made up of personal matters interesting chiefly to the Apostle and his immediate correspondents at Rome.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA quotes passages from both chapters frequently, and describes them as belonging to the Epistle to the Romans, without the least apparent consciousness that this could possibly be doubted.

ORIGEN. A most important though much disputed testimony to the genuineness of these chapters is found in Origen's Commentary upon the Epistle ('Opera,' tom. vii. p. 453, Lommatzsch; tom. iv. p. 687, ed. Ben.). After quoting the Doxology (xvi. 25–27) in its usual place at the end of the Epistle, Origen proceeds:

"Marcion, who tampered with the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, entirely took away this paragraph; and not this only, but also from that place where it is written, *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin* (xiv. 23), right on to the end, he cut all away (cuncta dissecuit). But in other copies, that is, in those which have not been corrupted by Marcion, we find this very paragraph differently placed. For in some manuscripts after the passage above mentioned, *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin*, there follows in immediate connexion (statim cohærens), *Now unto him that is of power to stablish you:* but other manuscripts have it at the end, as it is now placed."

This passage from Origen does not prove, as some have inferred, that Marcion regarded the Doxology in particular as spurious, nor that he appealed to earlier MSS. as omitting it, nor that Origen found it *omitted* in any other MSS. besides those which had been mutilated by Marcion.

It does prove that Origen knew of copies corrupted by Marcion, which omitted all after the last verse of ch. xiv.

It implies that, *as far as Origen knew*, (Lucht, p. 39) no *other* MSS. *omitted* the

Digitized by Google

Doxology, but some placed it between xiv. and xv.

Thus we have evidence of a *diversity of position* before Origen's time, and regarded by him as independent of Marcion's mutilated copies. But we have no evidence of *omission* before Marcion, who was at Rome propagating his views about A.D. 138–140. He *probably* disliked St. Paul's statements concerning the use of the Old Testament in xv. 4, 8, and *possibly* may have found an existing *diversity of position* to afford a pretext for his *omission* of xv., xvi.

We may further observe that when Marcion is said to have expunged and cut away ('abstulit,' 'dissecuit') the two chapters and the Doxology, it is clearly implied that these were genuine portions of St. Paul's Epistle *omitted first by Marcion.*

That this was the opinion of Origen himself, not merely of his translator Rufinus, is admitted and proved by Lucht himself (p. 36) and Origen's judgment may well be preferred to Lucht's baseless conjecture (adopted from Baur, 'Paulus,' p. 350) that Marcion may have omitted the two chapters because they were not written by St. Paul, but added by a forger (Lucht, p. 41).

II. From the testimony of the early fathers we pass to that of the existing MSS.

(*a*) Chapters xv., xvi. are not omitted in any known MS.

(*b*) The Doxology (xvi. 25–27) is variously placed, repeated, or omitted.

(1) It is placed at the end of xvi., and only there, in ℵ, B, C, D, E, f, Vulg., Syriac (Schaaf), Memph., Aeth., and the Latin fathers. The cursive MS. 66 after the ἀμήν of *v.* 24 puts τέλος, to mark the end of the Epistle, but then adds the Doxology, and has in the margin this note: "In the ancient copies the end of the Epistle is here (*i. e.* after the Apostolic benediction, *v.* 24), but the rest (*i. e.* the Doxology) is found at the end of the 14th chapter."

(2) It is found at the end of xiv., and there only, in L, most cursives, the Greek lectionaries, Syr. (Harclean), and Greek Commentators, except Origen.

(3) It is found in both places in A, P, 17, Arm.

(4) It is omitted in both places in F, G; but in F a blank space is left in the Greek after xvi. 24, and the corresponding space in the Latin (f) is occupied by the Doxology; while in G a blank space is left in the Greek, and consequently in the interlinear Latin, between xiv. and xv.

(*c*) In many manuscripts of the Latin Bible, especially codex Amiatinus, and Fuldensis, both of the 6th century, there is a division into sections (capitulatio) marked by numbers in the text, and a prefixed table of contents with corresponding numbers, in which the subject of each section is briefly described.

The 50th section in the Codex Amiatinus "On the peril of one who grieves his brother by his meat," corresponds with xiv. 15–23: But the next and last section, "On the mystery of the Lord kept secret before His passion, but after His passion revealed," answers to nothing else in the remainder of the Epistle except the Doxology. It is therefore a natural conclusion that this capitulation was first adapted to a Latin MS. in which the Doxology was placed immediately after xiv. 23 and xv., xvi. omitted. On these capitulations see Bp. Lightfoot, 'Journal of Philology,' 1871, No. 6, pp. 196–203.

(*d*) In one MS. (G) all mention of Rome in the Epistle is wanting.

In i. 7 for τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ, we find in G, τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ, the Latin (g) corresponding.

In i. 15 the words τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ are omitted in G and g.

One cursive manuscript (47) has a marginal note that some one, apparently an ancient commentator, "makes no mention of the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ either in the interpretation or in the text."

In this evidence "the statement of Origen respecting Marcion (confirmed by the incidental expression of Tertullian), the absence of quotations in several early fathers, and the capitulation (or capitulations) of the Latin Bibles," Bp. Lightfoot writes, "we have testimony various, cumulative, and (as it seems to me) irresistible, to the existence

Digitized by Google

of shorter copies of the Epistle, containing only fourteen chapters with or without the doxology, in early times."

"The *theory*, by which I sought to combine and explain these facts, was this; that St. Paul at a later period of his life re-issued the Epistle in a shorter form with a view to general circulation, omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Rome in the first chapter, and adding the Doxology, which was no part of the original Epistle" ('Journal of Ph.' 1871, No. 6, p. 203).

The theory was subjected to a friendly but keen and searching criticism by Professor Hort ('Journal of Ph.' 1870, No. 5), and defended in the following number by Bp. Lightfoot.

It is almost needless to say that the views of both writers are set forth with consummate skill, and the three papers are of great and permanent value to every student of the Epistle.

Professor Hort tries to prove, but as we venture to think unsuccessfully, that Marcion (as represented by Origen in the original reading of his comment) omitted only the Doxology, and not the two whole chapters: he attaches no great importance to the absence of quotations in Tertullian, Irenæus, and Cyprian: and thinks that the Doxology may have been transferred from the end of the Epistle to the position which it now holds in some Greek MSS., after xiv. 23, because chapters xv., xvi. were not much used in the Church lessons, "and yet some Church, for instance that of Alexandria, may have been glad to rescue the striking Doxology at the end for congregational use by adding it to some neighbouring lesson . . . Scribes accustomed to hear it in that connexion in the public lessons would half mechanically introduce it into the text of St. Paul (*i. e.* after xiv. 23) . . . Then in the course of time it would be seen that St. Paul was not likely to have written the Doxology twice over in the same epistle, and it would be struck out in one place or the other" (p. 72).

This alternative hypothesis is rejected by Bp. Lightfoot as "devoid alike of evidence and probability." He maintains that the capitulation of the codex Amiatinus has no trace of being intended for lectionary use (p. 202), that it was framed originally for a short copy of the Old Latin, yet maintained its ground as a common mode of dividing the Epistle, until it was at length superseded by the present division into sixteen chapters in the latter half of the 13th century."

Bp. Lightfoot upholds his theory simply as "the most probable explanation of the facts, until a better is suggested" (p. 194): and it is certainly less difficult to suppose that St. Paul himself at a later period of his life adapted the letter in a shortened form to general circulation (p. 214), than to accept M. Renan's complicated theory of four or five original editions addressed to different Churches, all at last brought together and compounded into our present Epistle.

But even this hypothesis of a shorter recension issued by the Apostle himself, put forth at first by Rückert and since so ably advocated by Bp. Lightfoot, seems to involve some serious difficulties.

(1) The capitulations are supposed to have been formed originally from a Latin copy of the Epistle ending with ch. xiv. yet no other trace whatever of such an abbreviated Latin codex now exists.

(2) If the abbreviated recension were made by St. Paul himself, and the Doxology added to it, and this at Rome, as Bp. Lightfoot suggests (p. 214), it is strange and almost unaccountable that no copy of this genuine abbreviated recension has been preserved, and that no known Latin codex contains the slightest trace of the position of the Doxology after xiv. 23. The blank space in the Latin, corresponding to that in the Greek of G proves nothing, as the Latin is interlinear.

(3) The assumption that the Doxology was originally placed after ch. xiv., and thence transferred to the end of the Epistle, is opposed to the evidence of the primary Uncials, א, B, C, of Origen's express statement concerning Marcion, of all Latin MSS., and of the Latin fathers; these all agree in placing the Doxology at the end of the Epistle, and there only.

(4) When St. Paul is represented as

Digitized by Google

converting his original Epistle to a new purpose by "omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Rome in the first chapter, and adding the Doxology," the process seems hardly in keeping with the truthful simplicity of the Apostle's character. There is truth in what Meyer says on this point: "Rückert's conjecture, that Paul himself may have caused copies without the local address to be sent to other Churches, assumes a mechanical arrangement in Apostolic authorship, of which there is elsewhere no trace, and which seems even opposed by Col. iv. 16."

(5) Bp. Lightfoot suggests (p. 213) that Marcion, who is known to have resided for many years in Rome, may have fallen in with a copy of the short Recension, and welcomed it gladly.

When we take into consideration Origen's express statement that *Marcion himself expunged and cut away the last two chapters*, it seems much more probable that the incomplete documents, from which the Capitulations were framed, were nothing else than copies of Marcion's own mutilated text, with the Doxology added. A mutilated Recension, known to be the work of an arch-heretic, was much more likely to have disappeared altogether, than an abbreviated Recension known as the genuine work of St. Paul himself.

(6) If, as Origen states, Marcion mutilated the Epistle by cutting off chapters xv., xvi. entirely, he would have a motive for removing ἐν Ῥώμῃ also in i. 7, 15: for a letter addressed by St. Paul to the Christians at Rome, in whom he was so deeply interested, could not possibly end so abruptly as at xiv. 23, without a single allusion to his own personal state or theirs, without a single greeting, without even his usual Apostolic Benediction. Marcion therefore is much more likely than St. Paul to have obliterated the mention of Rome in the 1st chapter.

Another possible explanation is suggested by Meyer, that "perhaps some Church, which received a copy of the Epistle from the Romans for public reading, may *for their own particular Church-use* have deleted the extraneous designation of place, and thus individual codices may have passed into circulation without it." Volkmar adopts a similar explanation (p. 74).

But on this supposition we should expect to find some of the Lectionaries omitting the words, whereas they all, apparently, contain them.

On the whole we cannot but admit the force of Lucht's conclusion (pp. 65, f.) that if the Doxology was written by St. Paul himself, its original place must have been at the end of the Epistle, and not after xiv. 23.

(*e*) The Benedictions. According to the received Text there are three concluding formulæ, the Apostolic Benediction at xvi. 20 (ἡ χάρις κ. τ. λ.), the same Benediction repeated at xvi. 24, and the Doxology.

The Benediction at xvi. 20 is undoubtedly genuine, being omitted only in those MSS. (D F G) which also omit the Doxology at the end, and leave the Benediction at xvi. 24 as the conclusion of the Epistle, the motive of these changes evidently being to reduce the Epistle to the accustomed form.

The Benediction at xvi. 24 is omitted in the chief uncials (א A B C), in Amiat. Fuld. and other MSS. of the Vulgate, in the Coptic and Aethiopic Versions, and in Origen.

It is found in this place in D, F, G, L, 37, 47, the Vulgate (Demid. Tol. and other codices), the Syriac (Harclean), and the Gothic, and in most of the Greek Commentators. It is put after the Doxology in P, 17, Syriac (Schaaf), Arm. Aeth.

Upon this evidence the Benediction at xvi. 24 is rejected by Lachmann, Tregelles, and in his last edition (8) by Tischendorf. Bp. Lightfoot, and Professor Hort reject it, but it is retained by Meyer, Fritzsche, Lange, Hofmann, Lucht (p. 82), Hilgenfeld ('Einleit.' p. 326), Reuss, Volkmar, as well as by older interpreters generally. The question therefore of its genuineness must be regarded as still under discussion.

Our own belief is that the Benediction is genuine in both places, and that in *v.* 20 it forms the conclusion of a later letter to the Church at Rome, of which

Digitized by Google

the fragment *vv.* 3–20 became incorporated with Romans. We thus account at once for the seeming repetition of the Benediction at *v.* 24, and also see a motive for its omission there in so many good MSS, there being no other example of such repetition.

### III. Internal Evidence.

(a.) *The Doxology.* Objections to the genuineness of the Doxology drawn from its special character are directed either against its form, its phraseology, or its ideas.

(1) *The Form.* It is alleged that the beginning and the end (τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι . . . . μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα κ. τ. λ.) show that there is a mixture of two different forms of Doxology. The whole difficulty lies in the superfluous Relative (ᾧ), and its position. This relative is omitted in the Vatican Codex and two cursives (33, 72), in f, the Latin of F, in Schaaf's Syriac, and by Origen (or Rufinus) in his commentary on the passage. Dr. Hort ('Journal of Philol.' No. 5, p. 57) thinks that "ᾧ is probably an intrusion, notwithstanding the presumption in favour of an irregular construction." Godet thinks that when St. Paul began the sentence, he did not mean it to end thus—"to him be glory"—but with some such thought as—"to him I commend you" (συνίστημι ὑμᾶς, Glöckler).

He adds "We give glory to him who *has done* the work; but in regard to him who *is able* to do it, we look to him to do it, we claim his help, we express our confidence in him and in his power." But this reasoning is at once refuted by a glance at Eph. iii. 20, τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ . . . . αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα κ. τ. λ.

Meyer joins διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ with σοφῷ, "God who through Jesus Christ has shown himself the only wise," the object of this harsh connexion being to avoid the supposed necessity of referring ᾧ to the person last named, Jesus Christ, and so ascribing the glory to Him. This necessity is neither more nor less than in Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, where see the notes.

Ewald translates as if the order were ᾧ διὰ Ἰ. Χ. ἡ δόξα, and supposes this natural order to have been changed for the sake of throwing an emphasis on "through Jesus Christ."

We can accept his translation as rightly expressing what St. Paul meant, but not his explanation of the unusual order, which is the main difficulty.

Upon the whole we are disposed to agree with Dr. Hort that "ᾧ is probably an intrusion," though of a very early date. We must admit that with so great a preponderance of external authority ᾧ ought to be retained in the text now, whatever may have been its origin. But on the other hand the authorities for the omission are varied and of considerable value: while the intrusion might very easily have been caused by the presence of ᾧ in the parallel passages Gal. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11. Rückert rejects ᾧ, and Reiche, in his Critical Commentary, concludes that the writer of the Doxology borrowed it from Heb. xiii. 21 or Jude 25.

The objection that St. Paul does not *end* his Epistles with a Doxology comes with little force from those who, like Baur and Lucht, count only three Epistles, besides Romans, to be genuine.

That the last clause of the Doxology is characteristic of St. Paul is seen in its close resemblance to xi. 36; Gal. i. 5; and its difference from 1 Pet. iv. 11; v. 11.

When Lucht urges that Doxologies forming long and complete sentences are not found in St. Paul's Epistles, but only in Eph. iii. 20, 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 18; Jude 24, 25; we can only reply that the three Epistles first named are *to us* St. Paul's, and as such they help by their many points of resemblance to the Doxology in Romans to confirm its genuineness.

Other objections to the length of the Doxology, to its numerous intermediate clauses, and to the mixture of strong emotion with profound doctrinal statements, are refuted by a due appreciation of the peculiar character of the Epistle. "The whole Epistle could hardly have a fitter close than a Doxology embodying the faith from which its central chapters proceed" (Hort, p. 56).

Digitized by Google

"The leading ideas contained in the whole Epistle, as they had already found in the introduction (i. 1–7) their preluding key-note, and again in xi. 33 ff., their preliminary doxological expression, now further receive, in the fullest unison of inspired piety, their concentrated outburst for the true final consecration of the whole" (Meyer).

(2) *Diction.* Lucht acknowledges that every single expression in the Doxology (except σεσιγημένον) may be found in St. Paul's genuine Epistles, by which he means Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians.

The Passive σιγᾶσθαι is found nowhere else in the N. T. or LXX: but St. Paul's use of σεσιγημένον is fully justified by such passages as Eurip. 'Iphigenia in Tauris,' 1076, πάντα σιγηθήσεται, Pindar, Ol. ix. 156, σεσιγαμένον οὐ σκαιότερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον, and many others.

The objection that the several words and phrases of the Doxology, though found in the four great Epistles, are there used only in other meanings or connexions, will for most readers be sufficiently answered by Lucht's further objection, that the Doxology in all these points agrees with what he calls non-Pauline writings, the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Timothy, and Titus.

These points of agreement are indicated in our foot-notes: and it is only necessary to add that the expression "everlasting God" (αἰώνιος Θεός), to which Lucht objects, is fully justified by the usage of the LXX not only in Job xxxiii. 12, αἰώνιος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπάνω βροτῶν, but also in the very striking passage Gen. xxi. 33, ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, Θεὸς αἰώνιος. Here "Jehovah is called the everlasting God as the eternally true, with respect to the eternal covenant which He established with Abraham xvii. 7" (Keil & Delitzsch). So remarkable a title must have been familiar to St. Paul, and its use here in reference to the same eternal covenant is so appropriate that the supposed objection is really a strong argument for St. Paul's authorship.

(3). *Ideas.*—Lucht's attempt to prove that the Doxology has a Gnostic tendency, and must therefore be of a post-Apostolic date, is rightly dismissed by Meyer as based only upon misinterpretation and a pre-supposition that all except the four greater Epistles of St. Paul are spurious.

(b.) *Chapters xv., xvi.* The objections brought by Baur, and the extreme partisans of his School, against the genuineness of these two whole chapters can have little weight except for those who accept his general theory of the purpose of the Epistle, which we have already examined in § 7 and found untenable. Assuming the preponderance at Rome of a Judaizing party to whom the earlier portion of the Epistle would have been distasteful, Baur sees in the last two chapters the work of a later "Paulinist writing in the spirit of the Acts of the Apostles, seeking to soothe the Judaists, and to promote the cause of unity, and therefore tempering the keen anti-Judaism of Paul with a milder and more conciliatory conclusion to his Epistle" ('Paulus,' i. p. 365.

Lucht, less bold than Baur, does not venture to treat the two chapters as wholly spurious: admitting that the original Epistle could not have ended at xiv. 23, he thinks that portions of the genuine conclusion are still to be found in chapters xv. and xvi. His theory is that the Roman clergy, fearing lest offence might be given by the Apostle's treatment of ascetic scruples as "*the infirmities of the weak*" (xv. i.), withheld the conclusion of the letter from public use, and laid it up in their archives together with a letter to the Ephesians which by mistake had been brought to Rome; and that these genuine Pauline materials were worked up by a later writer into the present form of the last two chapters.

According to Volkmar (pp. 129–132) the latter part of the genuine letter was either lost or purposely suppressed, and in the 2nd Century two attempts were made to supply a fitting conclusion to xiv. 23: in the Eastern Church the Doxology was added (xvi. 25–27), in the Western Church the greater part of the last two chapters, namely xv. 1–32, xvi.

Digitized by Google

3–16, and 17–20. Afterwards both additions were combined in various ways, and under this "Catholic conglomerate" of conciliatory matter lay the genuine conclusion long hidden, yet accurately preserved in two passages xv. 33—xvi. 2, and xvi. 21–24.

To all these arbitrary hypotheses we may apply the remark of Hilgenfeld ('Einleitung,' p. 323): "What is here regarded as un-Pauline only shews, according to my conviction, that since Marcion's time there has been a one-sided picture of St. Paul, to which some still desire to make the true Paul correspond." Compare in this Commentary the Introduction to 1 Peter, § 3.

As regards the xvth Chapter we may confidently say that the result of modern criticism has been to prove beyond reasonable doubt that it is both the genuine work of St. Paul and an original portion of the Roman Epistle. "It is undeniable that xv. 1–13 belongs to xiv. and that xv. 14–33 forms the conclusion of the Epistle" (De Wette, 'Kurze Erklärung,' p. 204). Pfleiderer ('Paulinism,' ii. 41, note) expressly maintains with Hilgenfeld, "in spite of Baur, Lucht, and Lipsius," that the chapter is genuine. The opposite opinion has now few advocates even in Germany.

In regard to Chapter xvi. the case is rather different. According to the conjecture of Schulz, adopted by Ewald, Renan, Reuss, Farrar and others, the greater part of the chapter belonged to a genuine letter of St. Paul addressed, not to Rome, but to Ephesus.

In considering this theory it will be convenient to examine each portion of the chapter separately.

*vv.* 1, 2. *The Commendation of Phœbe.*

It is objected that St. Paul could not have written this commendation of Phœbe to a distant Church, because he had shortly before expressed a disparaging opinion of commendatory letters (2 Cor. iii. 1). But if the Apostle in vindicating his authority asserts that he has no need of "*epistles of commendation*," it by no means follows that he thought them unnecessary for all persons. A woman undertaking a journey to a distant city might well need to be commended to the care of the Christian community, especially if she was (as is generally supposed) the bearer of the Apostle's own Epistle: compare the commendation of Timothy in 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11.

Another objection is brought against the description of Phœbe as being "*a servant* (διάκονος) *of the church which is at Cenchreae*," on the ground that the office of "deaconess" was of later origin. The objection would have had some force if the title (διακόνισσα), which was of later origin, had been used. We read in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 that the household of Stephanas had devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints (ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις): and such self-dedication to a special work, though quite consistent with a formal designation to the office, would even without it have been sufficient to justify the application of the general term διάκονος as descriptive of Phœbe in her work at Cenchreae. See our note on the passage.

In whatever way Phœbe had been "a succourer (προστάτις) of many," and of St. Paul himself also, there is nothing in such service inconsistent with his frequent assertions that he had not accepted any maintenance from the Churches of Achaia, for these assertions are all of an earlier date (1 Cor. ix. 15–18; 2 Cor. xi. 7–12; xii. 13–18).

For the opinion that this commendation was addressed to the Church of Ephesus, not to Rome, we can discover no reason at all: the suggestion that from Cenchreae she would be sailing towards Ephesus and away from Rome is sufficiently answered by saying that she may have been sailing not from Cenchreae, but from Lechaeum, the port on the Corinthian Gulf, and in that case would pass through Corinth on her way. Legal business would be more likely to take her to Rome than to any other city.

*vv.* 3–5. *Salutation sent to Aquila and Priscilla.*

We learn from Acts xviii. 1, 2 that these persons being Jews of Pontus were driven from Rome by the edict of

Digitized by Google

Claudius (A.D. 52); they were joined by St. Paul at Corinth, and thence sailed with him to Ephesus in the spring of the year 54, where they remained (Acts xviii. 19), and established "*a church in their house*" (1 Cor. xvi. 19). From Ephesus they sent a salutation to Corinth in St. Paul's 1st Epistle about April A.D. 57. Ten or twelve months later St. Paul, according to Rom. xvi. 3, sends a salutation to them "*and to the church that is in their house*" at Rome. In answer to M. Renan's objection that this would assign to them "too nomadic a life," Bp. Lightfoot asks with good reason, "Is there any real difficulty in supposing that they returned to Rome in this interval of a year more or less, and that St. Paul should have been made acquainted with their return, seeing that his own travels meanwhile had lain mainly on the route between Ephesus and Rome" ('Journal of Philology,' 1869, p. 276). In answer to the further objection that Aquila and Priscilla appear again at Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19) the Bishop asks with equally good reason, "Is it at all improbable that after an interval of nearly ten (eight?) years they should again revisit this important city? They were wanderers not only by the exigencies of their trade, but also by the obligations of their missionary work" ('J. of Phil.' p. 277).

So far as the internal character of the passage is concerned it might have been addressed either to the Church of Ephesus or to Rome: in favour of the latter destination a *prima facie* presumption is raised by its appearance in the Epistle to the Romans. It contains no indication of *the time* at which it was written.

*v.* 5 b. It does not follow from the description of Epaenetus as "*the first-fruits of Asia unto Christ*" that this greeting was sent to him in Asia, i.e. in Ephesus. Being named in immediate connexion with Aquila and Priscilla it is very probable that he, like Apollos, had been instructed by them and had attached himself to their company, whether at Ephesus or at Rome.

Of the 22 other persons named in *vv.* 6–15 not one can be shewn to have been at Ephesus, but it is assumed that only at Ephesus could St. Paul have had so many friends as are here saluted. Against this assumption we have to set several unquestionable facts.

(1) "Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia and Junia are specifically Roman names" (Lucht, p. 137).

(2) Besides the first four of these names ten others, Stachys, Apelles, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas (or Patrobius), Philologus, Julia, Nereus, are found in the sepulchral inscriptions on the Appian way as the names of persons connected with "Caesar's household" (Phil. iv. 22) and contemporary with St. Paul. Bp. Lightfoot in his most interesting essay on the passage has pointed out that while some of these names are too common to afford any safe ground for identifying the persons, others (Stachys, Tryphaena, Patrobas, Philologus, Nereus) are comparatively rare, and yet are found on the monuments of the imperial household at this period. The household of Aristobulus and the household of Narcissus could be only at Rome. "A combination such as Philologus and Julia," writes Bp. Lightfoot, "affords [more] solid ground for inference: and in other cases, as in the household of Narcissus, the probable circumstances suggest a connexion with the palace. If so, an explanation has been found of the reference to members of Caesar's household in the Philippian letter. At all events this investigation will not have been useless, if it has shewn that the names and allusions at the close of the Roman Epistle are in keeping with the circumstances of the Metropolis in St. Paul's day: for thus it will have supplied an answer to two forms of objection; the one denying the genuineness of the last two chapters of this letter, and the other allowing their genuineness, but detaching the salutations from the rest and assigning them to another epistle."

The answer seems to be conclusive both as to the genuineness of the salutations, and as to *the place* to which they were addressed, namely, Rome and not Ephesus.

But it does not remove what is after all the chief difficulty of the chapter, that at *the time* of writing his Epistle to

Digitized by Google

the Romans, St. Paul cannot easily be supposed to have had such an intimate knowledge of so many of the Christians at Rome. In the 'Journal of Philology,' 1869, No. 4, p. 274, Bishop Lightfoot, in reply to M. Renan, has suggested another explanation: "Will not a man studiously refrain from mentioning individual names where he is addressing a large circle of friends, feeling that it is invidious to single out some for special mention, where an exhaustive list is impossible? On the other hand, where only a limited number are known to him, he can name all, and no offence is given." In support of this explanation, it is urged that in other Epistles of St. Paul the number of names mentioned is in inverse proportion to his familiarity with the church to which he is writing: to Corinth, Thessalonica, and Philippi no salutations properly so called are addressed. "On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Colossians, whom the Apostle had never visited, certain persons are saluted by name." When we turn, however, to Colossians, we find only one salutation properly so called, i.e. addressed to a particular person by name: "*Nymphas and the church which is in his house.*" The example is therefore no parallel to the Roman salutations in which, including Aquila and Priscilla, twenty-four persons are saluted by name, besides several households.

This serious difficulty, and some others, are wholly removed, if, as we believe, the whole passage xvi. 3–20, belonged originally to a second letter addressed by St. Paul to the Roman Church *after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome.* On that supposition, the unusual number of salutations is at once explained, and the indications of intimate personal knowledge of so many members of the Church, some of whom seem to have belonged to "Caesar's household," not only raise no difficulty, but become the strongest proofs of a genuine letter.

In that case, Aquila and Priscilla may well be thought to have either preceded or followed St. Paul to Rome, and there to have alleviated his wearisome imprisonment, and even risked their lives for his sake.

Andronicus and Junia (*v.* 7), being as kinsmen of St. Paul, Jews by birth, well known to the other Apostles, and "in Christ" before St. Paul himself, must have been converted elsewhere than in Rome, most probably in Jerusalem. But when were they fellow-prisoners of St. Paul? If this description was written before his first imprisonment at Rome, we are left to conjecture that they may have shared some one of his many imprisonments, of which nothing more is known. But how much more forcible and appropriate is the description, if after his release and departure from Rome, he sent this salutation to two of those who had been his fellow-captives there. The word itself (συναιχμαλώτους) confirms the conjecture, for it is used nowhere else in the N.T., except concerning Aristarchus (Col. iv. 10), and Epaphras (Philem. 23), both of whom were Paul's *fellow-captives in Rome.*

It has been thought a difficulty that none of the persons named in *vv.* 3–16, are mentioned in the Epistles written from Rome during the first imprisonment. "How is it" (asks Dr. Farrar), "that not one of these exemplary twenty-six are among the three Jewish friends who are alone faithful to him, even before the Neronian persecutions began, and only a few years after this letter was despatched (Col. iv. 10, 11)?"

The answer is easy, if the passage (*vv.* 3–16), was addressed to Rome *after* the first imprisonment. For in Philippians, the salutations are only general: "The brethren which are with me greet you. All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household" (iv. 21, 22); in Colossians and Philemon, the persons named as sending salutations are St. Paul's companions and fellow-labourers, and there is not the slightest reason to believe that any one of them was a permanent inhabitant of Rome. It was not likely, therefore, that St. Paul, writing from a distance to Rome, should send them greeting: they probably left Rome when he did, if not before.

In like manner, it will be found, that

Digitized by Google

most of the difficulties felt in regarding *vv.* 3–16 as written at Rome in A.D. 58, are easily removed, if we suppose it to have been written *after his first imprisonmeut.* The accumulation of names, the endearing epithets, the characteristic descriptions of so many of the Roman Christians, no longer present any difficulties, but are, on the contrary, *most natural* after the Apostle's long imprisonment, with its many opportunities of gaining converts to the faith, of forming intimate friendships, and of receiving much necessary help and kindness.

The warning against false teachers (*vv.*, 17–20) is not merely consistent with this supposition of a later date, but adds much to its probability. For during his imprisonment at Rome St. Paul writes to the Philippians (i. 15–17), "*Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but the other of love.*" It is evident that the warning (Rom. xvi. 17–20) is much more natural and forcible, if written after St. Paul had quitted Rome, leaving these false Teachers behind him.

If this theory, that Rom. xvi. 3–20 is part of a letter written to Rome *after St. Paul's imprisonment there*, be accepted as in itself probable, it will help to confirm the tradition of a second imprisonment, and the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles.

## § 9.[1] Authorities for the Text.

### (1) *Uncial Greek Manuscripts.*

(*a*) The same as for the Gospels and Acts.

ℵ Codex Sinaiticus contains the Pauline Epistles entire.

A. Codex Alexandrinus: wants 2 Cor. iv. 13—xii. 6.

B. Codex Vaticanus: Heb. ix. 14—xiii. 25 by a later hand.

C. Codex Ephraem Syri: wants the following passages,—
Rom. ii. 5—iii. 21; ix. 6—x. 15; xi. 31—xiii. 10.
1 Cor. vii. 18—ix. 6; xiii. 8—xv. 40.
2 Cor. x. 8—Gal. i. 20.
Eph. i. 1—ii. 18; iv. 17—Phil. i. 22
Phil. iii. 5—iv. 23.
1 Thess. ii. 9—2 Thess. iii. 18.
Heb. i. 1—ii. 4; vii. 26—ix. 15; x. 24—xii. 15.
1 Tim. i. 1—iii. 9; v. 20—vi. 21.

For notices of these famous Uncial MSS. see Scrivener, 'Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.' 2nd ed., pp. 83–109, Tischendorf, 7th ed., Prolegomena cxxxv.—cli., and 'N. T. Graece, ex Sin. Cod.,' 1865. Compare also the Introduction to St. John's. Gospel, pp. lxxxix.—xciv., and the Introduction to Acts, pp. 345, 346.

(*b*) The following MSS. are not the same as those which are known by the same letters in the Gospels.

D. Codex Claromontanus, a very important MS. of the 6th century, Greek and Latin. It contains St. Paul's Epistles entire, except Rom. i. 1–7; also in Rom. i. 24–27 the Latin only, in Rom. i. 27–30 both Greek and Latin, and in 1 Cor. xiv. 13–22 the Greek only are supplied by later hands. See Scrivener, p. 151, Tischendorf (7th ed.), p. clxxxi.

E. Codex Sangermanensis, a mere transcript of D, made by some ignorant scribe: "the Greek is manifestly worthless, and should long since have been removed from the list of authorities" (Scrivener, p. 153). The Latin (e) is thought to be a little better.

F. Codex Augiensis, Greek and Latin, of the 9th century, at Trinity College, Cambridge, edited by Scrivener, 1859. "The Epistles of St. Paul are defective in Rom. i. 1—iii. 19; and the Greek alone in 1 Cor. iii. 8—16; vi. 7–14; Col. ii. 1–8; Philem. 21–25." In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Greek is wholly lost. See Scrivener, p. 154; Tisch. (7), p. clxxxv.

G. Boernerianus, at Dresden, part of the same volume as Δ of the Gospels, Codex Sangallensis, of the 9th century. The Greek text of 13 Epistles of St. Paul is from the same source as F, both being probably derived from a stichometrical MS. much older than themselves. The interlinear Latin is the Itala much altered. See Scrivener, p. 157; Tisch. (7), p. clxxxviii. It wants Rom. i. 1–5; ii. 16–26; and in the other Pauline Epistles the same passages which are wanting in F.

K. Mosquensis, a MS. of the 9th century, at Moscow, containing the Catholic Epistles entire, and St. Paul's Epistles, except Rom. x. 18, 1 Cor. vi. 13, and 1 Cor. viii. 7–11. Scrivener, p. 149.

[1] For references in the notes to § 9 for discussions on "The Law," and "The Flesh," see Appendix to this Introduction.

Digitized by Google

L. Codex Angelicus, formerly Passionei, of the 9th century, contains Acts (beginning at viii. 10), the Catholic Epistles, St. Paul's, and Hebrews as far as xiii. 10.

P. Codex Porfirianus, a palimpsest of the 9th century, edited by Tischendorf in the 5th and 6th volumes of his 'Monumenta Sacra Inedita." It contains Acts, all the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, but is defective in the following among other passages: Rom. ii. 15—iii. 5; viii. 33—ix. 11; xi. 22—xii. 1. See Scrivener, p. 150.

The readings of all the MSS. hitherto mentioned, are quoted by Tischendorf (8), and of all except E, by Tregelles.

The letters F*, H, I, M, indicate certain ancient and valuable fragments of uncial MSS., of which notices will be found in Scrivener, pp. 154–160.

(2) Of *Cursive Greek MSS.* there are for St. Paul's Epistles, nearly 300: the following are cited by Tregelles throughout his text, and frequently by Tischendorf.

17 (=Evang. 33), on parchment, of the 11th century, at Paris.
37 (Ev. 69), of the 14th century, at Leicester.
47, in the Bodleian, of the 11th century.

Tischendorf also names 67** as containing remarkable readings, very similar to B.

### 3) *Versions.*

The most ancient versions, especially the Latin, are of great importance for the criticism of the Greek text, being credible witnesses of its form at a time one or two centuries earlier than the oldest extant MSS.

*The Old Latin*, or Itala (it), dating from the 2nd century, is represented in St. Paul's Epistles chiefly by the Latin versions (d, e, f, g), attached to the Greek Uncials D, E, F, G. Tischendorf also quotes (gue) certain fragments of the 6th century, attached to the Gothic version of the Wolfenbüttel palimpsests (Codex Guelferbytianus), which contain Rom. xi. 33—xii. 5; xii. 17—xiii. 1; xiv. 9–20; xv. 3–13.

A few fragments (r), have also been found on the covers of the Frisingen MS. at Munich, containing parts of Rom. xiv., xv., and other passages of St. Paul's Epistles enumerated by Tischendorf (7), Proleg. p. ccxlvi.

*The Vulgate*, or Latin version corrected by Jerome, is best represented by the two following MSS. of the 6th century.

Codex Amiatinus (am), edited by Tischendorf, and adopted by Tregelles as the basis of his Latin text, was formerly in the Monastery of Monte Amiatino, but is now at Florence. "It was written about the year 541, by the Abbot Servandus" (Tisch. 8, p. ccxlvii.).

Codex Fuldensis (fu), in the Abbey of Fulda, in Hesse Cassel, was written in 546, by order of Victor, Bishop of Capua, and corrected and dated with his own hand. It is remarkable for the peculiar system of capitulation prefixed to the Epistle to the Romans, on which see above, § 8, p. 22.

On the Syriac, and other ancient versions used for criticism of the Text, the reader is referred to Tischendorf, Scrivener, or the Introductions to the N. T. by Tregelles, Bleek, and Hilgenfeld.

### (4) *Fathers.*

Among the Greek Fathers, Origen stands pre-eminent as "the prince of ancient Critics" (Tischendorf). In his Commentary on the Romans, various readings are often expressly discussed, and in such cases his testimony is indisputable. Next to him Tischendorf ranks Clement of Alexandria, and Irenæus: the work of the latter 'Against all Heretics,' is extant for the most part only in a very ancient Latin translation; but an illustration of its great value will be found in our Additional Note on Rom. v. 6.

Chrysostom's Homilies on all the Pauline Epistles are often useful to the critic of the text, as well as invaluable to the interpreter.

The earliest Latin Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles is that which is found in the works of St. Ambrose, and usually ascribed to Hilary the Deacon (Ambrosiaster), who is supposed to have lived at the close of the 3rd century.

On the value of the Fathers as witnesses to the Text, see Tischendorf (7) pp. cclv.–cclxix.

Digitized by Google

### § 10. Contents and Argument.

The main Divisions of the Epistle are clearly marked:

I. The Introduction, i. 1–15;
II. The Doctrine, "The Righteousness of God by Faith," i. 16—viii.;
III. The Doctrine reconciled with Israel's unbelief, ix.—xi.;
IV. Exhortation to Christian Duties, general and special, xii. 1—xv. 13;
V. Conclusion, xv. 14—xvi. 27.

I. The Introduction:

(a) Address of the Epistle (i. 1–7);
(b) The Writer's Motives (8–15).

(a) The Introduction is marked throughout by an earnest desire to win for himself and for his Gospel the confidence and goodwill of an important Christian community to which as yet he was personally unknown. This motive is seen in the threefold description of the *official character* which gives him the right to address them, as being Christ's servant, duly called to the Apostleship, and set apart as a chosen vessel to carry a message of glad tidings from God (*v.* 1).

In that message God's promises to His ancient people are fulfilled in Him who was both born of the seed of David to be Israel's Messiah, and proved by the Resurrection to be that Son of God who giveth life unto the world and hath all the Heathen for His inheritance. The Apostle of One who is thus manifested as the Saviour of the world must speak in His name to "*all nations*," and therefore to those at Rome also who by a Divine calling are already His (*vv.* 2–6: see above, pp. 12, 13). To all such who are in Rome, whether Jew or Gentile, beloved of God as partakers of His holy calling, Paul the Apostle sends this greeting: "*Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ*" (*v.* 7).

(b) To make his Apostolic claims the more acceptable St. Paul expresses his personal interest in the welfare of his readers, in thanksgiving for their faith (*v.* 8), in prayer that he may be permitted to see them (*vv.* 9–12), and in an assurance that he has long desired and still is eager to fulfil the duty of preaching the Gospel at Rome (*vv.* 13–15).

II. The Doctrine: "The Righteousness of God by Faith:"

(a) The Theme (i. 16, 17);
(b) The universal need of Righteousness (i. 18—iii. 20);
(c) The Universality of Righteousness by Faith (iii. 21—v.);
(d) The Sanctification of the Believer (vi.—viii.).

(a) Theme of the Epistle.

The mention of the Gospel, which St. Paul would fain have preached at Rome in person, leads naturally to a description of it as the great Theme of his Epistle (*vv.* 16, 17). In this brief statement of the subject we discern already the leading thoughts and main scope of the treatise which follows. The Gospel is no mere word of man, but (1) a "*power of God*" directed to man's salvation; a power which can not only do "*what the Law could not do*" (viii. 3), save from sin, but also create and impart a new life of righteousness.

(2) This "*power of God unto salvation*" is universal in its purpose, being needed and intended for "*every one;*" and in this universality "*the Jew*" is expressly included by name with "*the Greek*" or Gentile world. The priority assigned to the Jew in the received reading (πρῶτον) does not mean that he is to have a preference and advantage, but only that the salvation long promised to the Fathers is to be offered to him first: its condition is the same for him and for the Gentile: God's salvation is (3) for "*every one that believeth.*" This definition of the Gospel as bringing salvation to every believer is confirmed in *v.* 17, on which see the notes.

(b) The Universal need of Righteousness is seen in the unrighteousness of all, first of the Gentile (i. 18–32), and then of the Jew (ii. 1—iii. 20).

The foundation which St. Paul lays in this section (i. 18–32) is too broad and deep for an argument intended only to serve some occasional purpose arising out of the peculiar circumstances of the

Digitized by Google

Christians at Rome. Had it been his sole or chief purpose to remove the prejudices and abate the claims of Jewish Christians, there would have been no adequate motive for his elaborate description of the depravity of the Heathen world. So terrible a picture of sins against God and against nature, from some of the worst of which the Jews were comparatively free, must have been intended primarily to arouse the conscience of the Heathens themselves, and to prove their need of righteousness. Subordinate to this main purpose is the rhetorical use which the Apostle makes of the moral indignation which such a description could not fail to rouse in the Jew against the "sinners of the Gentiles."

Looking back from this point at the Introduction (*vv.* 1–15) we can understand St. Paul's anxiety to commend himself and his Gospel to the Romans, without assuming any intention either to attack or to conciliate an adverse Judaizing majority. His motive, which we can now clearly discern, was simply an earnest desire to win from all a favourable hearing for a Gospel which must at the outset be unwelcome both to Jew and Gentile, and more especially to the Jew, because it is founded on the fact that all alike are under sin, and exposed to God's wrath. The same motive explains why the order of *v.* 17 is reversed, and the Gentile first brought in guilty with the full assent of the Jew, who suddenly finds himself involved in the same condemnation: compare the note on ii. 1.

Knowing even more clearly than the Heathen "*the judgment of God, that they who do such things are worthy of death,*" the man who judges them, and does the same, is without excuse (ii. 1, 2). No personal privilege can exempt him from judgment, for God is no respecter of persons, but will render to every man according to his deeds, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile (*vv.* 3–11). The law will not benefit the Jew unless he be a doer of the law: even the Gentile will be judged by the law written on his heart (*vv.* 12–16). In vain therefore the Jew glories in a law which he does not keep, and in a circumcision which is only that of the flesh, not of the heart (*vv.* 17–29).

### iii. 1–8. The Jew's Objections answered.

Has then the Jew no real advantage? Yes, the oracles containing God's promises. Though disbelieved by some, their truth is unimpaired: they shall yet be fulfilled (*vv.* 1–4: compare ix. 6; xi. 25–32).

Man's unbelief exalts God's faithfulness. Is God unrighteous then in punishing this unbelief? Nay, for then it would be unrighteous to judge any sin. Yet if sin is overruled unto His glory, why judge the sinner? Why should we not rather go on sinning to His greater glory? The very thought deserves God's righteous condemnation.

### iii. 9–20. The Scriptures confirm the Charge of Universal Sinfulness.

If the Jew is exempted from Judgment neither by the Law, nor by circumcision, nor by the promises which remain true in spite of his unbelief—What then remains? Can we claim to be better in fact than the Heathen? Can we say that we Jews are "*doers of the law?*" Nay, in no wise: for the charge before made, that all are under sin, is confirmed by our own Scriptures. They testify that all, Jews as well as Heathens, are transgressors of God's law: and that law is binding on the Jew to whom it directly speaks God's commandments, that his mouth as well as every other may be stopped, and all brought into judgment before God, because by law man cannot attain to righteousness, but only to knowledge of sin.

Even apart from the repeated mention of the name "*Jew*" in this and the preceding chapter, it is evident that the errors which St. Paul uproots, and the sins which he condemns, are not those of the Jewish Christian, but of the unbelieving Jew. In the readiness to judge others, and the presumptuous hope of personal exemption from God's judgment (ii. 1–16), in the arrogance, hypocrisy, and self-



Digitized by Google

complacency of the sinner who in the midst of his sins makes his boast of God and the Law, and is confident that he is "*a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness*" (17–24), in the absolute reliance on circumcision (25–29), in the daring protest, "*Why yet am I also judged as a sinner?*" (iii. 7), repeated in ix. 19, "*Why doth he yet find fault?*"—in all this we see something very different from the legal and ceremonial tendencies of Jewish Christianity, we see the glaring sins and errors of Judaism itself in its worst state of corruption.

### (c) The Universality of the Righteousness of Faith.

From the universal need of the salvation described in i. 16, 17 St. Paul now passes on to its actual manifestation. He has shown that all alike are under sin, all exposed to God's wrath: the privileges of the Jew, though real and great, do not exempt him from judgment, nor does the law enable him to attain by his own works to righteousness. "*But now*," in the new dispensation of the Gospel, in contrast to wrath revealed from heaven against the unrighteousness of man, we see the "righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." This is the second point in the proof of the Thesis laid down in i. 16, 17.

### iii. 21–26. The Righteousness of God made manifest.

The essential characteristics of the righteousness of God are here combined.

(1) Independent of "**law**" as a condition of earning righteousness, it is witnessed by "*the law*" as a Divine revelation (*v.* 21).

(2) The mode in which man receives it is "**through faith in** *Jesus Christ;*" in which definition faith is seen to be the principle of that personal living union between Christ and the believer (*v.* 22) which is the root in man of all justifying and all sanctifying righteousness.

(3) Its universal destination "*unto all and upon all them that believe*" results from the nature of faith, as a condition corresponding to the true relation of all mankind to God, and therefore fitted to supply the universal want of "*the glory of God*" (*vv.* 22, 23; compare the notes on i. 16, 17 as to the nature of faith).

(4) The free and gratuitous character of God's salvation is seen, in that all who partake of it are justified not by merit but "*freely by His grace*" (*v.* 24).

(5) The substance of salvation, the gift which God's grace bestows and man's faith accepts, is "*the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*" (*v.* 24).

(6) The first cause of this redemption is God the Father's love: its method, "*propitiation*," i.e. an expiation for sin by which man is restored to God's favour: the efficient cause of propitiation, the one true sacrifice, Christ "*in His own blood:*" the appropriation by man of this redemption, "*through faith:*" the purpose of God in thus setting forth Christ,—"**for an exhibition of his righteousness,**" because He had suffered the sins of former generations to pass unpunished in the forbearance which He exercised "**in view of the exhibition of** *his righteousness*" **in this present time,**" that now He might be both righteous Himself as condemning sin and the author of righteousness to him, "**that is of faith in Jesus,**" *i.e.* who sees in the death of Christ the death for sin which he has himself deserved, and the death unto sin of which he is henceforth to partake.

### iii. 27–31. Justification by Faith independent of Law.

The righteousness of God, not being earned by works of law, excludes man's boasting (*vv.* 27, 28), recognises one God as the author of salvation for Jew and Gentile (*vv.* 29, 30), and far from abolishing "**law,**" establishes it in its true character as a law of faith: compare viii. 4.

### iv. 1–25. The Righteousness of God is witnessed by the Law and the Prophets.

Even Abraham, the great pattern of

righteousness, was justified by faith and not by merit of works (*vv.* 1–5), in accordance with David's description of the blessedness of free and undeserved forgiveness (*vv.* 6–8).

The righteousness of God is for all, not for the circumcised only: for circumcision was not the cause but the sign and seal of Abraham's justification by faith, marking him out as the father of all them that believe (*vv.* 9–12).

The inheritance of the Promise, depending not on law but on faith, is made sure to *all* the seed (*vv.* 13–17).

Abraham's faith, both in its strength, and in its object—"*God who quickeneth the dead*," is recorded for our example (*vv.* 17–25).

v. 1–11. REDEMPTION BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

The blessings received by those who are "*justified freely by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*" (iii. 24, 25) are Peace, Joy, and Hope of glory, all founded on God's love, which having reconciled enemies by Christ's death will much more surely save the reconciled by His life.

v. 12–21. THE UNIVERSALITY OF SALVATION BY FAITH, LIKE THE UNIVERSALITY OF SIN, IS BASED ON THE UNITY OF MANKIND IN ADAM AND IN CHRIST.

In the preceding argument the universal sinfulness of man has been established as a fact to which experience and Scripture both bear witness, but simply as a fact without any declaration of the cause of its universality.

On the other hand the universal salvation which God has prepared depends on Christ alone: instead of each man earning the pardon of his sins by virtue of his own repentance and subsequent obedience to the law, One dies for all, and for His sake not only forgiveness but righteousness and life are bestowed on all that believe in Him (v. 6–11). The universality of salvation is thus traced to its cause in the principle that "**the many**," "**the all**," are included in "**the One**." The Apostle now extends and completes his argument by showing that the Old Testament traces the universality of sin and death to the same principle: the one man through whom sin and death came into the world, and passed upon all men, is a type of the One through Whom come righteousness and life to all (*vv.* 12–14).

But this comparison involves also a contrast: God's grace is greater and more abundant than man's transgression: righteousness and life are in their nature mightier powers than sin and death. If sin and death could pass from one to all, *much more* shall righteousness and life (*vv.* 15–19).

We notice in *v.* 18 a pregnant phrase "*justification of life*," which combines and reconciles two leading elements of St. Paul's doctrine of salvation. On these two elements taken separately two opposite systems of doctrine have been raised, namely justification by imputation only, and justification by or on account of actual righteousness wrought in man by *faith working through love.*

The phrase "*justification of life*" occurs at a point of St. Paul's argument where these two elements of his teaching meet: for the doctrine of justification by faith without works of law ending with c. iv., and the doctrine of life in Christ, as the remedy for inherent sin and source of inherent righteousness, beginning at c. v., are both included in "*justification of life*." Faith, whereby we receive God's justifying sentence, is also the means by which we receive the new "*life*" that brings forth righteousness or holiness of living.

"If there had been a *law* given which could have *given life*, verily *righteousness* should have been by *law*" (Gal. iii. 21). But no place has yet been found for *law* in this "*justification of life*." St. Paul, however, now proceeds to show that "*law*" itself was in one way subservient to grace, even by multiplying transgression (*vv.* 20, 21).

Reserving his explanation of this purpose of the law to Ch. vii., the Apostle hastens at once to meet the formidable difficulty which so strange a statement could not fail to raise in the



Digitized by Google

mind not only of a conscientious Jew but of every thoughtful reader.

(d) The Sanctification of the Believer.

In iii. 8, St. Paul has alluded very briefly to a false charge that by his teaching he encouraged the wicked thought, "*Let us do evil that good may come.*" His doctrine of grace has in fact in all ages been misrepresented by unscrupulous opponents and perverted by hypocritical supporters. His own answer to the question, "*Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?*" should have made such perversion of his teaching impossible. That answer is founded on the same mystical union between Christ and the believer which is also the ground of his justification: and the doctrine of God's free grace through faith in Christ is thus found to be the only sure foundation for holiness of life.

vi. The Moral Effects of Justification by Faith.

The believer baptized into the death of Christ both dies with Him to sin, and rises in Him to newness of life (*vv.* 1–11). Let this truth be realised henceforth in your lives (*vv.* 12, 13), for this is the right effect of being no longer "*under* law *but under grace*" (*v.* 14), that you are released from the bondage of sin, and set free for the service of God (*vv.* 15–23), free, and yet "*servants to righteousness unto* sanctification."

vii. Deliverance from the Bondage of Law and of Sin.

Hitherto St. Paul has spoken of the law in a negative sense: he has shown that it had not in fact enabled the Jew (Ch. ii.), and according to the Scripture could not enable any man, to attain to righteousness by works, but only to a knowledge of sin (iii. 20); that it has no part in the manifestation of the righteousness of God, except as a witness (iii. 21); that as a law of works it could not exclude man's boasting (iii. 27); that it was not attached as a condition to the inheritance of Abraham's blessing (iv. 13); that it worketh wrath (iv. 15); that its effect was the imputation of sin, and the multiplication of transgression (v. 13, 20); and thus under law men were brought into bondage to sin (vi. 14).

Such a disparaging view of the law must have been a grievous obstacle to a conscientious but unenlightened Jew: it needed both to be explained and supplemented.

It is explained by the principle that the power of law is terminated by death: for example, as a wife is released from the law that binds her to her husband by his death, and is free to marry another, so the believer by the death of "*the old man*" with Christ (vi. 6) is released from the law, and free to be united to another, even Christ, who is raised from the dead (vii. 1–6).

*vv.* 7-13. Relation of the Law to Sin.

If that former union was a bondage to sin, and if to be free from sin we must be free from the law, the question arises, "*Is the law sin?*" In answer to this question St. Paul proceeds to supplement his account of the law by showing its true nature, and its actual relation to sin (*vv.* 7–13). Sin, or in other words the perverse opposition of man's will, is roused into activity by the law, and exhibits its exceeding sinfulness as a power working death by means of the law which was ordained to life. For the law in itself is holy, just, and good: it is "*spiritual*," as being a Divine revelation, but it is not a life-giving spirit, and therefore cannot enable man to overcome the power of sin.

*vv.* 14–25. The Conflict of Flesh and Spirit.

The Apostle confirms his vindication of the Divine Law by an analysis of the working of sin, as he had observed it in his own inner experience. At first he speaks of himself as if that part of his nature which in action predominates were the whole man; "*The law is spiritual; but I am* of flesh, *sold under sin.*" But closer observation reveals an inner conflict: the flesh, in

Digitized by Google

which dwelleth no good thing is not the whole man (*v.* 18), there is another "I," consenting unto the law *that it is good:*" this better self, "*the inward man*" (*v.* 22), "*the mind*" (*v.* 23), or what St. Paul calls in 1 Cor. ii. 11, "*the spirit of man that is in him,*" delights in the law of God, but is overpowered by the sin which rules as a law in the members of the outward man. This true self cries in anguish, "Who shall deliver me?" and the cry is at once turned into thanksgiving by remembrance of the deliverance already wrought by God through Jesus Christ (*vv.* 24, 25).

viii. THE SPIRIT OF LIFE IN CHRIST JESUS BRINGS LIBERTY TO THE CHILDREN OF GOD, AND COMFORTS THEM WITH THE HOPE OF GLORY.

The doctrine that man is justified freely by God's grace through union with Christ (v. 12—21) has been defended against two chief objections of the Jew. It has been shown (1) in Ch. vi. that far from encouraging continuance in sin, the union with Christ *implies in principle* a death unto sin, and an entire release from its dominion; and (2) in Ch. vii. that the Law, though holy and spiritual in itself and recognised as such by man's mind or spirit, cannot overcome the power of sin in the flesh, but rather becomes an occasion of strengthening its dominion.

The question, "Who shall deliver me?" is now to be answered: "*The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.*" Sin already condemned in the flesh by Christ's death is to be destroyed by "*the Spirit of life*" which He imparts for the fulfilment of the righteousness of the law (*vv.* 1–4). This Divine Spirit not only subdues "*the mind of the flesh,*" which "*is enmity against God*" and therefore "*death,*" but will at last give life even to the body now dead because of sin (*vv.* 5–13).

The same Spirit of Christ testifies that we are sons of God, and partakers of His inheritance of glory if we partake of His sufferings now (*vv.* 14–17). No present suffering is to be compared with that glory, for which the whole creation is groaning and sighing, and we ourselves are waiting in hope of its completion by the redemption of our body (*vv.* 18–25). Already we have help for our infirmity in the Spirit's intercession (*vv.* 25–27), and the knowledge "*that all things* (even sufferings) *work together for good to them that love God,*" because they "*are called according to His purpose.*"

For *whom He foreknew as loving Him*, He predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, and that predestination cannot fail to be accomplished in their calling and justification, and glorification, because nothing can separate them from God's love (*vv.* 28–39).

We pause for a moment to establish our interpretation of this most difficult and important passage by the authority of the first Christian Father, Clement of Rome, "who had seen the blessed Apostles and conversed with them, and still had the preaching of the Apostles ringing in his ears and their tradition before his eyes" (Iren. iii. 3, § 3). In the newly recovered portion of St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians (lix. 9) we find a clear reference to Rom. viii. 28 in the words: "Who dost make many nations upon earth, and out of all *didst choose them that love thee through Jesus Christ* thy beloved Son, through Whom Thou didst chasten, sanctify, and honour us."

III. THE DOCTRINE RECONCILED WITH ISRAEL'S UNBELIEF.

The purely doctrinal portion of the Epistle is concluded. Each part of the Theme proposed in i. 16, 17 has now been developed in a clear and closely connected argument. Without Christ all nations alike are lying under the wrath of God, all without excuse, the Heathen condemned by his own conscience (i. 32), the Jew by the law to which he trusts in vain to justify him by his own works (iii. 20). But now in Christ the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, independent of law yet witnessed by the law and the Prophets, extending unto all them that believe God's gifts of peace and hope and everlasting life.

Digitized by Google

That St. Paul has treated the doctrine of justification by faith with especial reference to the prejudices of the Jews is obvious. But it is not a necessary inference from this mode of treatment, that a Judaizing tendency prevailed among his readers.

The objections brought forward on the part of the Jew are inherent in the subject itself, and must have entered into a discussion of the doctrine to whomsoever addressed.

Moreover St. Paul's own mind was full of the questions concerning Judaism, and the mode of treating it. The Epistle to the Churches of Galatia had been written but a short time before: there the Judaizing party had striven to the utmost to accommodate Christianity itself to Jewish prejudices. St. Paul had vehemently opposed this retrograde movement both in person and in his Epistle. Now he could regard the whole question of the relation of Judaism to the Gospel more calmly, deliberately, and comprehensively. For he was writing to a Church in which he had no personal antagonists, and where party-spirit had not yet embittered the great controversy: a Church moreover set in the midst of so numerous a colony of unbelieving Jews, that the question of their rejection was seen in all the greatness of its proportions.

Hence we see that the subject discussed in Chapters ix—xi. cannot possibly be regarded as a mere historical appendix, nor as a corollary to the previous doctrine: it is in fact the reconciliation of that doctrine to the great and pressing difficulty which had arisen from the rejection of the Gospel by the great mass of the Jewish people.

ix. 1–5. MOURNING OVER ISRAEL.

With seeming abruptness, yet in close connexion of thought, St. Paul passes from the joyful assurance of salvation for all the elect of God (viii. 28–39) to the mournful and mysterious contrast presented by the exclusion of the chosen people on whom so many and great privileges had been bestowed.

*vv.* 6–13. GOD'S PROMISE HAS NOT FAILED.

The present rejection of Israel is not to be regarded as a failure of God's promise; the unbelief of some does not make the faithfulness of God of none effect, iii. 3; for the promise was not to all the seed of Abraham after the flesh, but to the chosen seed, not to Ishmael but to Isaac, not to Esau but to Jacob.

*vv.* 14–18. NOR IS THERE ANY INJUSTICE IN GOD.

Far be it from us to say that God is unjust in thus choosing one and rejecting another, before they have done good or evil. His choice is not determined by the merit of man's works, but by His own free and undeserved mercy, for it is proved by His words to Moses and to Pharaoh that "*on whom he will, he hath mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*" On the reference to Pharaoh in *v.* 17 see the foot-note and the Additional note at the end of the chapter.

*vv.* 19–21. GOD'S ALMIGHTY WILL MAY NOT BE QUESTIONED.

If God's will is absolutely free and irresistible, "*why doth He yet find fault?*" Why hold man responsible?

The Apostle first rebukes the arrogance of thus contending with God, and asserts that His rightful power (ἐξουσία) over man is as absolute and unquestionable as that of the potter over the clay that he fashions.

Had this been the only answer, the Jew could not have found fault with it, for it is drawn from his Scriptures; but St. Paul has another answer.

*vv.* 22–29. GOD'S JUSTICE AND MERCY VINDICATED.

After asserting God's unquestionable right to deal with the creatures of His hand according to His Will, the Apostle proceeds to justify God's actual dealing with Israel, as characterised by long-suffering towards those who were deserving only of wrath, and by mercy towards those whom He called both from

Digitized by Google

among Jews and also from among Gentiles to be His people.

Moreover both the calling of the Gentiles, and the rejection of all except a small remnant of Israel, had been foretold by the Prophets,—a proof that there had been no failure of His promise in its true meaning.

*vv.* 30–33. THE PARADOX EXPLAINED.

It is a strange result that Gentiles who were not consciously seeking righteousness attained to righteousness, while Israel, who sought, did not attain unto a law of righteousness. And wherefore? Because the Jews did not seek what the Gentiles attained, a righteousness of *faith*, but sought righteousness by works of law, and so stumbled against the Rock which was laid in Zion for a sure foundation to every one that *believeth*.

We must not leave this Chapter without drawing attention to the great importance of the statement of Christ's Deity in *v.* 5, and to the general misunderstanding of the passage concerning Pharaoh (*v.* 17) consequent on the defective translation of the original passage in the A. V. Both points are fully discussed in the Additional Notes to the Chapter.

x. 1–4.—THE CAUSE OF ISRAEL'S STUMBLING.

They sought to establish their own righteousness by works of law, and refused to submit to God's righteousness which is attained by *faith*, because they were ignorant that "*law*," regarded as a way of attaining to righteousness before God, is at an end in Christ, in order that righteousness may be extended to every one that *believeth*

*vv.* 5–10. THE TESTIMONY OF MOSES.

Israel ought not to have been ignorant of "*the righteousness which is of faith*," for Moses himself not only "*describeth the righteousness which is* **of law**," but also speaks of another kind of righteousness, a religion of the heart, which is the righteousness of faith in Christ.

*vv.* 11–21. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH IS OFFERED TO ALL, BUT REJECTED BY ISRAEL.

St. Paul emphatically asserts the universality of the statement already quoted in ix. 33, "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed" (Isai. xviii. 16) as proving that in the righteousness of faith there is no difference between Jew and Greek; and then from two other passages (Joel ii. 30; Isai. lii. 7) proves that the Gospel must be preached to all.

"*But they did not all obey the* **glad tidings**:" yet it was not from want of hearing, nor of warning, for Moses and Isaiah foretold both the reception of the Gentiles, and the disobedience of Israel.

xi. THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

Twice already the Apostle has intimated that the unbelief of the great mass of the Jews has not annulled the faithfulness of God's promises (iii. 3; ix. 6). The same thought is here brought into close connexion with the certainty of salvation for God's elect (viii. 28–39), "*God hath not cast away His people, which He foreknew*," the true Israel. But who are the true Israel? Not the unbelieving mass (compare ix. 6), but the "*remnant according to election of grace*." The existence of such a remnant of believing Israelites amid a general apostasy proves now, as in Elijah's days, that God had not rejected Israel *as a people*.

And as He has not rejected the people on account of the unbelief of the majority, so neither has He preserved the remnant on account of their own merit, but only of grace (*vv.* 1–6).

What then is the result? The mass of Israel seeking righteousness of works obtained it not; the elect, foreknown of God, and chosen to be His people, obtained righteousness of grace through faith: and this hardening of the mass is what the Prophets have foretold as a just judgment from God (*vv.* 7–10).

But what is God's purpose herein? Is it that they should fall finally? Far from it: already their stumbling has brought salvation to the Gentiles, and this transfer of God's favour shall provoke the Jews to jealousy, and so end in the

Digitized by Google

restoration of God's ancient people, and a new life of the world (*vv.* 11–15). Such a restoration is natural, for the holy root of the chosen race makes its branches holy: ye Gentiles are but grafts of wild olive enriched by that holy root. Boast not that natural branches were broken off to make room for you; for if God spared not them neither will He spare thee, and if they turn from their unbelief, the goodness and power of God which grafted thee contrary to nature into the good olive, shall much more surely graft in again the natural branches (16–24).

This Divine purpose, that the hardening of Israel should bring salvation to the Gentiles, and so lead at last to the restoration of all Israel, is a mystery revealed now, and long since indicated in Isaiah: and God's gracious purposes can never fail, but even disobedience is so overruled that He may have mercy upon all (25–32).

O depth of God's wisdom surpassing all that man's heart could conceive! O depth of inexhaustible riches, receiving from none but giving freely to all! For *from Him* as their first cause all things begin, *through Him* still working in them they work together, *and unto Him* they tend as the final cause of all: "*To Whom be the glory for ever, Amen*" (*vv.* 33–56).

It is impossible to look back on the whole course of the Apostle's argument, from the revelation of God's wrath against an ungodly world (i. 18) to this mystery of God's all-embracing mercy, without feeling that, whatever local, temporary, or personal circumstances may have induced St. Paul to address this letter to Rome, such an exposition of the Gospel could only have proceeded from the mind of one who was moved by the Holy Ghost to write for all ages and for all mankind. "A more far-reaching glance was never cast over the Divine plan of the history of the world" (Godet).

### IV. Exhortation to Christian Duties.

The doctrinal part of the Epistle now concluded is followed by an exposition of Christian duty closely connected with it, and hardly less systematic and comprehensive. It consists of two main portions:

(a) The general duties of the Christian life (xii., xiii.);

(b) The special duty of mutual forbearance and charity in regard to things non-essential (xiv. 1–xv. 13).

#### (a) xii., xiii. The Christian's Duties towards God, and towards Man.

The Apostle has set forth "*the mercies of God*" in his survey of the Divine purpose and method of salvation. These mercies he now applies as motives to holiness, beginning with the central thought of self-consecration. Conform not even outwardly to the fashion of this world, but be inwardly transformed, your bodies being devoted to God's service, your minds renewed to know His perfect will (1, 2).

Presume not on special gifts, but as members of one body in Christ employ them for the good of all (3–8). Let love, the soul of all Christian virtues, animate your conduct towards your brethren in Christ, and towards all men, even your enemies (9–21).

Obey the rulers of the State, as powers ordained of God (xiii. 1–7). Fulfil the royal law of mutual love (8–10), and remembering that the day of Christ is at hand, put on the armour of light, put on the new man (11–14).

#### (b) xiv. 1—xv. 13. Special Exhortation to Mutual Forbearance between Christians.

Despise not the scruples of the weak conscience, neither condemn the freedom of the strong. We are all God's servants: do all things as unto the Lord: and prepare for His judgment, instead of judging one another (1–13). In things indifferent give no offence; for meat or drink lead not thy brother into sin (24–23).

Let the strong bear with the weak, as Christ has borne with us: receive one another, as Christ has received us (xv. 1–7). He came to fulfil God's

Digitized by Google

promises to Israel, and to extend God's mercy to the Gentiles: rejoice in Him, for ye are all His people (8–13).

The Apostle's reason for addressing to the Christians at Rome this special exhortation to mutual forbearance is to be sought in the divergence of views between the Jewish and Gentile believers: see above, pp. 17, 18.

V. CONCLUSION:

(a) The writer's motives and prospects (xv. 14–33);

(b) Concluding salutations (xvi.).

(a) Bear with my boldness in admonishing you, for I am a minister of Christ, to present the Gentiles as an acceptable offering (14–16). I glory therefore, yet only in what Christ has wrought through my preaching His Gospel to them who had not heard His name (17–21). Often hindered by this duty, I now am free to come to you on my journey into Spain, as soon as I have carried to Jerusalem the alms of the Gentile Churches here (22–29). Pray for my deliverance from the unbelieving Jews, for the acceptance of my service by the saints, and for my coming to you in joy. "*And the God of peace be with you all*" (30–33).

(b) Commendation of Phœbe (1, 2); Apostolic greetings (3–16); Warning against false teachers (17–20); Salutations from St. Paul's companions (21–23); Benediction (24); Doxology (25–27).

On the contents of this Chapter compare § 8, pp. 24–29.

There is a close correspondence between the Introduction and the Conclusion of the Epistle, both in form and thought. The section (a) answers to i. 8–15, while in (b) we find in the Doxology a fulness of thought and majesty of expression which harmonize well with the character of the opening address (i. 1–7).

## APPENDIX.

### "THE LAW," THE FLESH."

In several important passages of this Epistle it is essential to a right understanding of St. Paul's argument that we should be able to determine the exact meaning of the word "*law*" (νόμος) with and without the Definite Article.

"It must be admitted," says Bp. Middleton, 'On the Greek Article,' p. 303, "that there is scarcely in the whole N. T. any greater difficulty than the ascertaining of the various meanings of νόμος in the Epistles of St. Paul."

One of the earliest remarks on the subject is that of Origen on Rom. iii. 21: "Moris est apud Græcos nominibus ἄρθρα præponi, quæ apud nos possunt Articuli nominari. *Si quando igitur Mosis legem nominat, solitum nomini præmittit Articulum:* si quando vero naturalem vult intelligi, sine Articulo nominat legem." Though the form of the first sentence ("apud Græcos," "apud nos") shews that it is due to the Latin translator Rufinus, the rule about the use of the article seems to have proceeded from Origen himself: for it is the basis of his whole interpretation of Rom. iii. 21, both in the Commentary and in the Philocalia, cap. ix.

It is admitted on all hands that this rule, so far as it refers to the Law of Moses is *generally true*, i.e. that where the law of Moses is meant νόμος usually has the Article prefixed.

Is the rule true without exceptions?

If there are any exceptions, are they merely arbitrary, or can they be explained on any known principle, so as not to destroy the general rule?

In other words does St. Paul use νόμος and ὁ νόμος indifferently to signify the particular law of Moses?

Bp. Middleton maintains the general truth of the rule, admitting "no other exceptions than those by which words the most definite are frequently affected." We must first inquire on what principle the general rule is founded, and then consider the alleged exceptions.

A clear view of the nature of the Article, and of the effect of its insertion or omission, was long since given by Mr. T. S. Green, "Grammar of the N. T. Dialect," 1842, p. 132. "The Article is prefixed to a word, when it conveys an idea already in some degree familiarized to the mind, and in so doing

Digitized by Google

expresses something definite. Definiteness attaches to the *general idea*, when this idea is *identified with one which has been already impressed upon* the mind. The Article is a sign of this identification, and thus is closely but not primarily connected with definiteness." (Slightly abridged.)

Again, p. 165: "Since the Article is prefixed to a word when its idea is already familiarized, and is a mark or intimation of that circumstance, the natural effect of its presence is to divert the thoughts from dwelling upon the peculiar import of the word, and is *adverse to its inherent notion standing out as a prominent point in the sense of the passage*, it being an unquestionable law that, while novelty excites attention and scrutiny, familiarity is commonly associated with a passing glance."

The first passage to which Mr. Green refers (p. 171) as illustrating "the tendency of the presence of the Article to divert the attention from the peculiar inherent meaning of a word to which it is prefixed, and of its removal to recall it" is Joh. i. 1, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος: "Had the Article been prefixed, the sense would have been, that the Word was identical with the entire essence of the sole Deity. In the actual words Θεός is the predicate; that is, all that is involved in the notion of Θεός is predicated of the Word, namely the proper nature and attributes of Deity. The absence of the Article, further, admits of the Divine Word being possessed of this nature in common with other beings or Persons."

The importance and correctness of this statement will be at once seen by referring to Professor Westcott's note on the same passage in this Commentary: "It is necessarily without the Article (Θεός not ὁ Θεός) inasmuch as it describes the nature of the Word, and does not identify His Person. It would be pure Sabellianism to say the Word was ὁ Θεός."

Again on Joh. v. 27, Dr. Westcott writes: "The omission of the Article concentrates attention upon the nature, and not upon the personality of Christ."

Again on xix. 7: "The omission of the Article (υἱὸς Θεοῦ) concentrates attention upon the nature and not upon the personality of Christ."

We thus see that the principle on which Mr. Green founded the general rule for the insertion or omission of the Article is accepted by Professor Westcott: we shall find presently that it is no less clearly recognised by Bp. Lightfoot.

Unfortunately Mr. Green was not consistent in applying his own principle to St. Paul's use of the word νόμος: this, he writes, "is precisely a case in which it might be expected that the constant and familiar use of the word would lead to the dropping of the Article; and that such was the actual effect, may be concluded from such passages as the following: Rom. x. 4, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός, 1 Macc. ii. 21, καταλιπεῖν νόμον καὶ δικαιώματα" (p. 228).

Mr. Green infers that we cannot safely conclude "that the Apostle never uses the anarthrous word to signify the Jewish Law." "But," he adds, "it would scarcely be too hardy an assumption, that *the Apostle has been precise with respect to the Article in those passages of his writings where any ambiguity was undesirable*."

This uncertain mode of speaking virtually abandons many passages to the caprice, or preconceived opinions of individual Commentators. It will be made clear by a few examples that the question can hardly be said to have been as yet expressly and finally settled.

Dean Alford writes on Rom. ii. 12 ff. "Νόμος *throughout* signifies the law of Moses, even though anarthrous, in every place except where the absence of the Article corresponds to a *logical* indefiniteness, as e. g. ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος, *v.* 14: and even there not "*a* law": see note." The note on *v.* 14 is, '*are to themselves* (so far) **the law**, not '*a* law, &c.'

Again, on ii. 13 (οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου), "νόμος was indisputably the law of Moses."

These statements seem directly opposed to Mr. Green's view of the effect produced by omission of the Article. They are equally opposed to Dr. Vaughan's careful distinction of νόμος

Digitized by Google

and ὁ νόμος in his notes on Rom. ii. 12–15.

Bp. Ellicott in his Commentary on Galatians adopted Dean Alford's view, while Bp. Lightfoot agrees with Mr. Green, Dr. Westcott, and Dr. Vaughan. Thus on ii. 19, διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, Bp. Ellicott writes (in 1854) "The real difficulty in these words rests on the meaning of νόμος: this must be decided on exegetical grounds, for it appears most certain that νόμος may be anarthrous, and still clearly mean the law of Moses: see Winer, 'Gr.' § 8." Accordingly the Bishop adds that "Νόμος in each case has the same meaning; that meaning is the Mosaic law."

Bishop Lightfoot, on the contrary, writes on the same passage: "The written law—the Old Testament—is always ὁ νόμος. At least it seems never to be quoted otherwise. Νόμος without the Article is 'law' considered as a principle, exemplified no doubt chiefly and signally in the Mosaic law, but very much wider than this in its application."

The same difference runs throughout the two Commentaries on Galatians, as may be seen by referring to the notes on iii. 18; iv. 4, 5; v. 18; vi. 13. Also on Philipp. iii. 5, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος, Bp. Ellicott's note is, 'in respect of the law (of Moses) *a pharisee.* "Νόμος is here the 'Mosaic law,' &c.": while Bp. Lightfoot writes: "νόμον] *law'* not '*the law'*; for though the Mosaic law is meant, it is here regarded in the abstract as a principle of action, being co-ordinated with ζῆλος and δικαιοσύνην." See below, p. 47.

When opinions so distinctly opposite are so strongly maintained on either side, it is reasonable to suppose that some further investigation of the facts of the case is necessary. We propose therefore to examine the usage of the word νόμος, with and without the Article (i.) in the Septuagint, (ii.) in the New Testament generally, and (iii.) in St. Paul's Epistles.

i. Usage in the Septuagint. As Tromm's Concordance to the LXX is notoriously imperfect, we shall endeavour to supplement its deficiencies from the excellent Hebrew Concordance of Fürst.

We may first observe that the word (תּוֹרָה), of which νόμος is the usual rendering, has a very wide range of meaning. According to Fürst it means "doctrine, instruction, teaching paternal and Divine; hence the whole Mosaic law, and also the whole word of God, both law and ordinances, then the law specially, and particular laws and precepts, then metaphorically system and method (2 Sam. vii. 19)."

For an instance of the more general sense of the word we may refer to the note in this Commentary on Mic. iv. 2, "*for the law shall go forth of Zion.*" "Rather, *for* **out of Zion** *shall go forth* **a law.** The Hebrew word for *law* literally signifies *instruction.* The old law is not what is here meant, but the *fulfilment* of it (Matt. v. 17, 18), the teaching of Christ."

Another point to be noticed is that in regard to the use of the Article the Septuagint follows the Hebrew very closely.

Thus the word νόμος is used to translate תּוֹרָה about 187 times, and only in about six passages do the Hebrew and the Greek differ as to the insertion or omission of the Article. In four of these places (Prov. xxviii. 4 (twice), xxi. 18, Isai. xxiv. 5) the LXX have *improperly inserted* it, as is well explained by Delitzsch in his note on Isai. xxiv. 5: "Understanding the earth as we do in a general sense, '*the law*' cannot signify merely the positive law of Israel. The Gentile world had also a *Torâh* or divine teaching within, which contained an abundance of divine directions (tōrōth)." With this view agree Jerome, Aben-Esra, Vitringa, Rosenmüller.

In Mal. ii. 8, 9 (ἐν νόμῳ) the LXX have overlooked the Article in בַּתּוֹרָה.

Nor does this close agreement imply a departure from the general use of the Article in Greek: for "in Hebrew the Article is employed with a Noun to limit its application in nearly the same cases as in Greek or German (*or English*), namely, only when a *definite* object, one *previously mentioned*, or *already known*, or *the only one of its kind*, is the subject of discourse" (Gesenius, 'Hebrew Grammar,' § 109).

Digitized by Google

Of the 187 passages above mentioned ὁ νόμος is used in 120 with other defining words which render the Article necessary: these examples need no discussion.

The same may be said of five other passages, in which τοῦ νόμου is dependent on a Noun which has the Article, either τὸ βιβλίον or τοὺς λόγους (2 Ki. xxii. 11, xxiii. 24, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 19; Neh. viii. 3, 9); and in *one* passage 2 Ki. xxii. 8, βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου εὗρον, where τοῦ νόμου seems to be dependent on an *anarthrous* Noun, the Article before βιβλίον has been *improperly* omitted by the LXX from a literal adherence to the Hebrew, in which the antecedent Noun is in the construct state and therefore without the Article.

In eight passages (2 Chr. xxxi. 21; Ezra vii. 10; x. 3; Neh. viii. 2, 7; x. 34, 36; xiii. 3) ὁ νόμος has the Article because "the Law of Moses" is meant, *i. e.* the Pentateuch as a whole, or possibly in Ezra x. 3 the particular law about the marriage of Priests. In Jer. ii. 8 (וְתֹפְשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה) the LXX have added μου unnecessarily. In Zeph. iii. 4 Tromm reads ἀσεβοῦσιν εἰς τὸν νόμον, but Field has ἀσεβοῦσιν νόμον, which agrees with the Hebrew.

Adding the four passages above mentioned in which the LXX have improperly inserted the Article, we have 140 passages in which ὁ νόμος occurs, and out of these there are only eight, in which, without some further definition, it stands for "the Law" of Moses. In fact it is only in the later books 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, that this limited sense of "the Law" is found.

It remains for us now to examine the forty-seven passages in which νόμος is used without the Article.

In twenty of these passages νόμος is followed by a Genitive defining the giver of the law Κυρίου, Θεοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, Μωϋσέως, μου.

In three other passages (Neh. ix. 13; Mal. ii. 6; Prov. xiii. 15) νόμος, followed by a Genitive, has a perfectly general sense "a law of truth," "a wise man's instruction."

In three passages νόμῳ is found with the Preposition ἐν, 2 Chr. xv. 3, ἐν οὐ νόμῳ, where it is perfectly indefinite, and Mal. ii. 8, 9 ἐν νόμῳ, on which see above, p. 43.

In two passages the genitive νόμου depending on an anarthrous Noun seems at first sight to mean definitely "the law."

But in the first of these passages 2 Chr. xxxiv. 15, βιβλίον νόμου, the LXX have been again misled, as in 2 Ki. xxii. 8, by the omission in Hebrew of the Article before the Noun in the construct state: there they wrote βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου, here more consistently βιβλίον νόμου, while in both passages τό βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου would have been the right rendering.

In the other passage, Prov. vi. 23, λύχνος ἐντολὴ νόμου καὶ φῶς is a mistranslation of the Hebrew, which means a "**commandment is a lamp, and instruction** (Torâh) **is light**," the Articles being wrongly inserted in the A. V. See Delitzsch on the passage, and at p. 42 of his Commentary on Proverbs: "In vain do we look for the name Israel in the Proverbs, even the name Torâh has a much more flexible idea attached to it than that of the law written at Sinai: compare xxviii. 4; xxix. 18, with xxviii. 7; xiii. 14, &c."

In four of the remaining nineteen passages we find νόμος εἷς, which needs no remark. In three more (Deut. xxxiii. 3; Neh. ix. 14; Isai. li. 4) the A. V. renders νόμος rightly without the Definite Article. In twelve passages (Prov. xxviii. 7, 9; Isai. ii. 3; viii. 16, 20; Jer. xviii. 18; Lam. ii. 9; Ezek. vii. 26; Mic. iv. 2; Hab. i. 4; Hagg. ii. 11; Mal. ii. 7) the meaning is indefinite, "instruction" or "law," and the Article is wrongly inserted in the A. V., not being found in the Hebrew.

We thus arrive at the general result that νόμος, *without the Article, and without some defining Genitive, never means* "the law" of Moses *as a definite whole.*

This result is confirmed by the twenty-two passages in which νόμος, with or with out the Article, is found in the Apocrypha.

When it means definitely "the law," it either takes the Article (Ecclesiasticus xlix. 4; 2 Macc. iv. 17; vii. 9; Sus. *v.* 62) or is followed by a defining Genitive or

Digitized by Google

Relative (Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 23; xxxix. 1, 8; xli. 8; xlii. 2; xliv. 20; xlv. 17; xlvi. 14).

In seven passages (Ecclesiasticus xxxii. 15, 24; xxxiii. 2, 3; xxxiv. 8; xxxv. 1; xlv. 5) the *general* meaning (Divine instruction, a precept, a law) is evident.

In 1 Macc. ii. 21 (*καταλιπεῖν νόμον καὶ δικαιώματα*), the passage quoted by Mr. Green, the omission of the Articles may be explained by the principle of "enumeration" (Winer, p. 149, note 2; Middleton p. 99), or we may very properly retain the literal rendering ("to forsake law and ordinances"), thus bringing out into prominence the inherent force of the ideas. The three remaining passages (1 Macc. x. 37; xi. 34, 57) have no bearing on the question before us.

ii. Usage in the New Testament generally.

When we turn to the New Testament, we find that in the Gospels *νόμος* occurs thirty-two times, and has the Article in all except three passages. In Luke ii. 23, 24 *ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου*, the Article is omitted either because a particular law is meant (Ex. xiii. 12; Lev. xii. 6), or more probably on account of the anarthrous *Κυρίου*, as frequently in the LXX.

In Joh. xix. 7 ("*We have a law*") *νόμον* refers *indefinitely* either to the whole law, or to the particular law Lev. xxiv. 16,—*indefinitely* because the speakers do not assume that it was previously known to Pilate, or else to draw attention to the authoritative character of the code, as *law* which ought to be carried out.

These three exceptions in no way affect the truth of Origen's rule when applied to the Gospels, that when the law of Moses is meant the Article is always used (*ὁ νόμος*). We also observe in the Gospels that *ὁ νόμος*, without further definition, has become the recognised title of the Mosaic Law, or Pentateuch.

In Acts *ὁ νόμος* occurs nineteen times, *νόμος* only once xiii. 39 (*ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως*), where the defining Genitive renders the Article unnecessary.

In the Epistle of St. James the word is found ten times. Twice only (ii. 9, 10) it means "the law" of Moses as a whole, and has the Article.

In three passages the omission of the Article brings out emphatically the character of the particular law meant as "a *perfect law*" (i. 25), a "*royal law*" (ii. 8), "a *law of liberty*" (ii. 12).

In the five remaining instances, ii. 11, and iv. 11, where *νόμος* recurs four times, it is to be rendered simply "law" as in the perfectly similar passage Rom. ii. 25, where see note.

iii. Usage in St. Paul's Epistles.

Before proceeding to examine St. Paul's usage of the word, let us remind ourselves that the question is whether *νόμος without the Article* is ever used, like *ὁ νόμος*, simply as a Proper Name of "the law" of Moses. We have found no such use in the LXX, Apocrypha, Gospels, Acts, or Catholic Epistles. Is it to be found in St. Paul?

The best mode of answering the question will be to classify the uses of the word first in other Epistles, and then separately in Romans.

In St. Paul's Epistles, other than Romans, the word occurs forty-seven times, not including 1 Cor. vii. 39, where *νόμῳ* is interpolated.

(1) *ὁ νόμος*. In eighteen passages it has the Article 1 Cor. ix. 8, 9; xiv. 21, 34; xv. 56; Gal. iii. 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 24; iv. 21; v. 3, 14; vi. 2 (*τ. ν. τοῦ Χριστοῦ*); Eph. ii. 15; 1 Tim. i. 8.

In all these passages it means *the law of Moses*, except in Gal. vi. 2, and probably 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

(2) *νόμος*. (*a*) In three passages it is evidently, from the form of the sentence, indefinite: Gal. iii. 21, *εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος κ. τ. λ.* v. 23, *κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος* (a quotation from Aristotle: see note on Rom. ii. 14), 1 Tim. i. 9, *δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται.*

(*b*) In six passages we have the phrase *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου* (Gal. ii. 16, thrice; iii. 2, 5, 10), on the meaning of which see our note on Rom. iii. 20, and Bp. Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 10.

On this point we refer with pleasure to Mr. S. C. Green's excellent 'Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament,'

Digitized by Google

p. 218; "Rom. iii. 20: ἐξ ἔργων νόμου κ. τ. λ., **by deeds of law** *shall no flesh be justified*, for **by law** *is the knowledge of sin*.

The omission of the Article shows the truth to be universal, applicable to all men, and to every form of law. Compare *v.* 28; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 2, 5, 10, in all which passages the Article is consistently omitted."

St. Paul's work would have been but half done, if he had only proved that man could not be justified *by the works of the Law of Moses*. What he has proved, and what gives to his Epistle its eternal significance is that *by no works of law*, by no legal obedience, can man in any age or nation earn for himself righteousness before God: if he could, Christ's death was needless (Gal. ii. 21).

(*c*) In Gal. ii. 19, νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, the law of Moses is regarded in its nature as "**law**": non quia Mosis, sed quia lex. "I died to law," as a principle of justification.

In Gal. vi. 13, οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν, the meaning is that the circumcisionists, who enforce the particular ordinance, are not themselves in the full and true sense "*doers of law*," because they omit "*the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and faith*." In both passages the absence of the Article gives prominence *to the general idea* "**law**," and the Apostle's thought gains breadth and force by the more exact rendering.

In the remaining eighteen passages νόμος without the Article is governed by a Preposition διά, ἐξ, ἐν, κατά, ὑπό: 1 Cor. ix. 20 (four times); Gal. ii. 19, 21; iii. 11, 18, 21, 23; iv. 4, 5, 21; v. 4, 18; Philipp. iii. 5, 6, 9.

The notion that in these passages νόμος is anarthrous simply because it is governed by a Preposition has nothing in its favour: it is opposed to the constant usage of the LXX, Apocrypha, and Gospels, in none of which (as we have seen above) is there a single passage where νόμος meaning "the law" of Moses loses its Article on account of being governed by a Preposition, except where the LXX overlooked the presence of the Article in the Hebrew. On the other hand in every passage where the Article is omitted, the context not only admits the exact rendering "law" but gains by it a more forcible and comprehensive meaning.

As a crucial test we may take the passage Rom. iii. 31, νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πιστέως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἱστάνομεν. Dean Alford's note is as follows: "νόμος not '*law*' but '**the law**,' as everywhere in the Epistle. We may safely say that the Apostle never argues of *law*, abstract, in the sense of *a system of precepts*—its attributes or its effects—but always of THE LAW, concrete,—*the law of God given by Moses*, when speaking of the Jews, as here: *the law of God*, in as far as written on their consciences, when speaking of the Gentiles."

Can we really believe that St. Paul meant, what is thus attributed to him, "we establish THE LAW," concrete, the law of God given by Moses to the Jews? Before answering, let the reader study what St. Paul had written a few months before to the Galatians (ii. 18) with Dean Alford's own commentary upon it: "*If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor*." The *force* of the verse is—You, by now re-asserting the obligation of the law, are proving (*quoad te*) that your former step of setting aside the law was in fact a *transgression* of it."

It appears inconceivable that St. Paul, after this, should say "we establish the law," but it is perfectly natural that he should say, "we do not annul, nay we establish, *law* in its true character and essential nature as a revelation of the holy will of God," which can be fulfilled only through faith in Christ (viii. 4). See our notes on the passage.

We proceed to classify the various uses of νόμος in the Epistle to the Romans.

I. We find ὁ νόμος about thirty-five times, sometimes in a tropical sense (as in vii. 21, 23; viii. 2), but usually meaning the law of Moses.

II. In about forty passages νόμος is without the Article, and its meanings may be classified as follows:—

(*a*) νόμος "*law*" in a tropical sense, "a ruling principle."

Digitized by Google

Rom. ii. 14, ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος.
„ iii. 27, διὰ νόμου πίστεως.
„ vii. 23, ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου.
„ 25, νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.
ix. 31, νόμον δικαιοσύνης.
„ „ εἰς νόμον [δικαιοσύνης].

No one could think of applying these passages to the Law of Moses.

(*b*) νόμος "*law*" in an unlimited sense, in negative or interrogative sentences.

iii. 27, διὰ ποίου νόμου;
iv. 15, οὗ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.
v. 13, μὴ ὄντος νόμου.

To these passages we cannot hesitate to add

ii. 14, τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα.
„ „ οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες.

See the notes on this verse.

(*c*) In another class of passages the omission of the Article brings into prominence the nature of "*law*" as a general principle:

ii. 17, ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ.
„ 25, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς.
„ „ ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς.
„ 27, παραβάτην νόμου.
iii. 31, νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν;
„ „ ἀλλὰ νόμον ἱστάνομεν.
v. 20, νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν.
vii. 1, γιγνώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ.
vii. 2, ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ.
x. 4, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός.
xiii. 8, νόμον πεπλήρωκεν.
„ 10, πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη

After carefully studying these passages we shall feel no doubt that the same general idea of "law" is to be found in the following passages:

ii. 12, ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον. διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται.
ii. 23, ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι.
iii. 20, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.
iii. 21, χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη πεφανέρωται.
iv. 13, οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία.
iv. 14, οἱ ἐκ νόμου.
v. 13, ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν.
vi. 14, οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον.
„ 15, οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον.
vii. 7, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου.
„ 8, χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά
„ 9, ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ.

iii. 20, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται.
„ 28, χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.
ix. 32, ὡς ἐξ ἔργων [νόμου].

In the only remaining passage vii. 25, νοὶ δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ, we might explain the omission of the Article as in Luke ii. 23, but the antithesis νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας shows that the proper rendering is "**a law of God**" "a divine law." See note.

In this last class (*c*) are found the passages, which have been thought to prove most certainly that νόμος is used indifferently with ὁ νόμος as a Proper Name for "the Law" of Moses.

For a more correct interpretation we must refer to the foot-notes on each passage.

We may however refer here to one or two passages in which, at first sight, it may seem difficult to maintain the correct translation of the indefinite νόμος.

In Phil. iii. 5, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος (cited above, p. 43), if we introduce the definite sense "*the Law*," we should be obliged to include the Oral Law, for it was the fundamental principle of the Pharisees to make the Oral Law as binding as the written Law of Moses. The real meaning however is that St. Paul had been as strict as any Pharisee "**in regard to law**," because he had looked upon **law** as the principle of justification before God.

In 1 Cor. ix. 20, τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπὸ νόμον, μὴ ὢν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον, St. Paul's meaning is that he was not, like the unconverted Jews, "**under law**" as a condition of righteousness. In no other sense could he say that he was not himself under the law, unless the law were limited to the Ceremonial as distinct from the Moral Law.

But can we adopt this distinction? Can we say that St. Paul's expression, "*Ye are not under the law, but under grace*," applies only to the Ceremonial and not to the Moral Law? It is clearly impossible. For what is the example

Digitized by Google

chosen by the Apostle to prove that we are delivered from the Law? It is no outward ordinance, no ceremonial observance, but a moral precept, the deep heart-searching principle of moral obedience. "*Thou shalt not covet*" (Rom. vii. 7, μὴ ἐπιθυμήσεις). This is the law of which St. Paul says that it wrought in him all manner of concupiscence, and that sin took occasion by it, and slew him. How could these deadly effects result from the moral law which is holy just and good, ordained to life, except from its being perversely regarded as a means of earning justification, which its nature as **law** forbids?

Lastly, as the best apology for a long discussion, we will quote the weighty words of Bp. Lightfoot, "on a fresh Revision of the New Testament," p. 99. "The distinction between νόμος and ὁ νόμος is very commonly disregarded, and yet it is full of significance. Behind the concrete representation—the Mosaic law itself—St. Paul sees an imperious principle, an overwhelming presence, antagonistic to grace, to liberty, to spirit, and (in some aspects) even to life—abstract law, which, though the Mosaic ordinances are its most signal and complete embodiment, nevertheless is not exhausted therein, but exerts its crushing power over the conscience in diverse manifestations. The one—the concrete and special—is ὁ νόμος; the other—the abstract and universal—is νόμος. To the full understanding of such passages as Rom. ii. 12 *sq.*, iii. 19 *sq.*, iv. 13 *sq.*, vii. 1 *sq.*, Gal. iii. 10 *sq.*, and indeed to an adequate conception of the leading idea of St. Paul's doctrine of law and grace, this distinction is indispensable."

We will only add that "law" assumes this form of an imperious principle opposed to grace and liberty only when it is viewed *as the condition of justification*, the means of attaining to righteousness before God through the merit of good works. Viewed according to its true idea as the expression of God's will, and the guide of man's obedience, it "is holy, just, and good," "spiritual," and "ordained to life" (vii. 10, 12, 14).

### The Flesh.

The word "flesh" (σάρξ) occurs twenty-eight times in Romans, and frequently in St. Paul's other Epistles, especially Galatians: it has various meanings which must be carefully distinguished, if we wish to have a clear understanding of the Apostle's teaching in many important passages. The inquiry has been made more necessary by the efforts of recent writers to show that St. Paul's use of the words "flesh" and "spirit" agrees not so much with the Old Testament as with the dualism of the Greek philosophy of his age.

This view of St. Paul's doctrine of "*the Flesh*" is adopted with various modifications by Holsten, R. Schmidt, Lüdemann, and Pfleiderer. Their several views are briefly stated and compared by Wendt in a good monograph "Die Begriffe: Fleisch und Geist;" Pfleiderer's views are contained in his 'Paulinism,' pp. 35–67. We can only notice the chief points of the theory.

The Finite and the Infinite, Man and God, are said to be conceived by St. Paul as "Flesh" and "Spirit." These are contrasted first in a physical sense.

"Flesh" is the earthly, material, living substance of man's body; even the "*soul*" (ψυχή) is included in the "*flesh*," being the vitality or animating force of its earthly matter. The antithesis to "*flesh*" is "*spirit*," a higher material but not earthly substance, belonging exclusively to the Divine nature, and having as its essential characteristic a life-giving force. According to one view (Holsten's) the whole man is made up of "*flesh*": "*spirit*" forms no part of his nature, but is simply transcendental and Divine (Wendt, pp. 80, 86).

"*Flesh*," in its physical aspect, is weak, transient and *perishable*: in the intellectual world it is the principle of *error*: in the sphere of morals, it is the principle of *evil*, and here it comes into direct conflict with "*spirit*," as an opposing force (*ib.* p. 81).

"*Thus from the opposition of physically different substances*, as set forth in 1 Cor. xv. *results the dualism of antagonistic moral principles*" (Pfleiderer, i. p. 54).

Digitized by Google

"Flesh and Spirit botn are to Paul not inert but active substances (Rom. viii. 5 ff.). The flesh works as sensual desire, the spirit as non-sensual will" (Holsten, 'Das Evangelium d. Paulus,' p. 127).

This idea of the "*flesh*" is supposed to pervade St. Paul's system of doctrine: it explains his view of the Law, of Sin, of Christ's Person and work.

(1) Disregarding the ceremonial ordinances as having reference only to the "flesh," he recognises the Moral Law as spiritual and divine.

(2) Sin has its natural source in the "*flesh*," which is in itself unholy, in opposition to "*spirit*" which is holy. But the sin thus actually grounded in man's nature (ἁμαρτία) is at first unconscious and guiltless, and is thus distinguished from conscious transgression (παράβασις). Indwelling sin is thus a real though unconscious tendency of the "*flesh*" to strive against the "*spirit*," and the spiritual law, and thus it inevitably and of necessity produces conscious transgression and the sense of guilt (*ib.* p. 82).

(3) Christ even in His pre-existent state is regarded as man, the heavenly *spiritual* man: His "flesh" belongs not to His permanent Being, but only to His earthly life.

Sin (ἁμαρτία, not παράβασις) dwelt in His flesh as in that of other men: and hence the indwelling power of sin was destroyed in the destruction of the earthly substance of His flesh.

The "new life" of believers consists in the gift of the Divine spirit whereby they appropriate and realise in their own persons this effect of Christ's death, by continually subduing the flesh to the spirit, a process which will be perfected only in the end of the world, when matter, in its grosser form, will be wholly overpowered by spirit (*ib.* p. 83).

It is evident even from this brief and imperfect sketch that in this so-called Pauline doctrine we have quite "another gospel," and not that which St. Paul has been usually supposed to preach. The theory, in all the various forms under which it is presented, is mainly founded upon the assumption that St. Paul regards the "*flesh*" as essentially sinful. It thus involves the necessary consequence that our Blessed Lord not only bare "*the likeness of sinful flesh*," but that His flesh itself was sinful: see note on viii. 3.

It will not then be thought a needless labour if we try to ascertain what meaning the Apostle really attached to a word so important in his teaching as "the flesh."

1. In its original and proper meaning σάρξ denotes the material of the living body, whether of man or of other animals, as in Lev. xvii. 11.

In this sense it occurs in ii. 28, "*circumcision, which is outward in the flesh*": compare Bp. Lightfoot's note on Col. i. 22, "*in the body of his flesh.*" It must be observed that in xiv. 21, "*to eat flesh*," the Greek word is not σάρξ but κρέας, which means dead flesh, a distinction rightly observed by the LXX in translating the Hebrew word (בשר) which means flesh either dead or living.

2. In the common Hebrew phrase "*all flesh*" (Gen. vi. 12, 13, 19; vii. 21) all earthly living things are included with man, except where the context limits the meaning to mankind (Job xii. 10; Ps. lxv. 2; Joel. ii. 28). In Rom. iii. 20, οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, a quotation from Ps. cxliii. 2, St. Paul has substituted "*no flesh*" for "*no man living*," and the change may have been made on purpose to strengthen the contrast between man, in his imperfect nature, and the God before whom he stands.

3. "*Flesh*" is applied by St. Paul to human kindred, as in ix. 3, "*my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh*;" xi. 14, "*my flesh.*" This usage, like the preceding, is derived from the Old Testament: see Gen. xxxvii. 27, "*he is our brother, and our flesh.*" We cannot see that it necessarily implies, as Wendt supposes, p. 159, a *contrast* between the merely human relation, and the relation of man to God, or between "*flesh*" and "*spirit.*" The nature derived by kinsmen from a common ancestor is simply described by that part of it which is visible and palpable.

In ix. 8, on the other hand, there is an express contrast made between "*the*



Digitized by Google

*children of the flesh*" and "the children *of the promise*," equivalent to the contrast in Gal. iv. 29 between him "*that was born after the flesh*" and "*him that was born after the Spirit.*"

In iv. 1, where Abraham is called "**our forefather according** *to the flesh*," a similar contrast seems to be implied between a merely natural and a spiritual relation.

In neither passage however does the contrast, expressed or implied, involve a judgment upon the *moral* quality of "*the flesh*," but it is distinguished from "the Spirit," as that which is *merely* natural from that which is above nature.

In this usage σάρξ represents man's purely natural, earthly condition, a condition in which he is subject to infirmity, suffering, and death, subject also to the temptations which work through the senses and their appetites, but not originally and essentially sinful.

It is in this sense that Christ is said in i. 3 to have been "*made of the seed of David* **as to** *the flesh*," and in ix. 5 to have sprung "*as concerning the flesh*," from Israel. In both passages σάρξ denotes what was simply and solely natural in his earthly life.

4. Though "the flesh" is not essentially sinful, it is essentially weak, and hence the word is used to describe man in his weakness, physical, intellectual, or moral.

As connoting mere physical weakness σάρξ is found in several passages of St. Paul's Epistles (2 Cor. iv. 11; vii. 5; xii. 7; Gal. ii. 20; iv. 13) but not in Romans. We may remark that such a passage as Gal. ii. 20, "*the life that I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God*," is decisive against the notion that "flesh" is something essentially sinful.

Yet mere physical weakness of the flesh may be a hindrance to man's spirit, as in Matt. xxvii. 41, "*the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak;*" and the human spirit thus hampered by the weakness of the flesh is so far unfitted to be the organ of the Spirit of God.

This opposition of "the flesh" to all that is spiritual is more clearly marked, when "*the flesh*" is regarded as the cause of *intellectual* weakness: this is the case in Rom. vi. 19, "*I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh*," a passage which should be compared with 1 Cor. ii. 14, iii. 1.

5. Before we proceed to examine the passages in which St. Paul speaks of "*the flesh*" in its *ethical* quality as affected by sin (σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας), it will be desirable to notice how those who would prove that the Apostle regards "the flesh" as essentially sinful endeavour to remove the obstacle presented by Rom. v. 12 to the acceptance of their theory.

It is admitted by Pfleiderer ('Paulinism,' p. 45) that the words *sin entered into the world* "undoubtedly imply the entrance of something new, which consequently did not previously exist at all," and therefore "it is quite out of place to introduce here the doctrine of the σάρξ as the *natural* principle of sin, for this passage expressly exhibits the principle of sin *not* as natural, but as *of historical origin*."

This evident meaning of Rom. v. 12 is admitted to be inconsistent with the doctrine attributed to St. Paul in Rom. vii., that "*the flesh*" is originally and by its own nature, prior to the first man's transgression, the principle of sin. But instead of regarding this *formal contradiction* as a reason for doubting his own view of the doctrine in Rom. vii., Pfleiderer finds in it a reason for setting aside what he has already admitted to be the unquestionable meaning of v. 12: "If we are compelled to confess that there is a *formal contradiction* between Rom. v. 12 f. and Paul's doctrine of the sinful σάρξ, we are all the more justified in penetrating through the obvious form of the doctrine in Rom. v. 12 f. to the speculative idea embodied in it, which is so plainly suggested by the actual words of Paul, where he identifies the act of Adam with the common act of all. So soon as we grasp the thought that it was not in truth the first man as an individual who was the subject of the fall, but man as man, we see the historical beginning to be merely the form which expresses the universality of the principle which has no beginning; and thus the sub-

Digitized by Google

stantial agreement of the passage with the line of thought in Rom. vii. is placed beyond doubt."

Before we can consent thus to set aside the obvious and acknowledged sense of Rom. v. 12 in favour of a "speculative idea" altogether contradictory to "the Jewish theological doctrine" (Pfleiderer, p. 46), we ought to be fully convinced that the proposed interpretation of the Apostle's line of thought in Rom. vii. is at least as obvious and as certain, as his meaning in Rom. v. 12 is acknowledged to be. In other words, it ought to be shown that in Rom. vii. "*the flesh*" is distinctly declared to be originally and in its own nature sinful, and that no other interpretation is admissible.

We proceed to examine this point.

In vii. 5, "*when we were in the flesh*" St. Paul speaks as one who is "*in the flesh*" no longer: "*the flesh*" therefore cannot here mean the material substance of the body *per se*, nor this earthly bodily state *per se*, but only as subject to some quality formerly attached to it, namely, as the context shows, a predominant sinful propensity. This quality is therefore accidental and separable, and not of the essence of "*the flesh*" considered as the material substance of the body: and so St. Paul can write "*the life that I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God*" (Gal. ii. 20), a passage which, as clearly as Rom. vii. 5, refutes the notion that "*the flesh*," i.e. the material living substance of the body, is essentially sinful.

The next passage in which the word occurs is vii. 18, "*For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.*" Here not only is the moral weakness and worthlessness of "*the flesh*" asserted in the strongest possible terms, but the utter absence of good is alleged as evidence of something worse than weakness, of positive indwelling sin (*v.* 17).

"*The flesh*" then is regarded by St. Paul as a dwelling-place, and seat, not necessarily the only seat, of sin: but it is important to observe that his judgment is the result of practical experience (οἶδα), not of any speculative analysis of the ideas of "*flesh*" and "*sin.*" He found as a fact sin dwelling in his flesh: we may add that he regarded this as a fact of universal experience (iii. 9—20): but we have no reason to suppose that he regarded sin as inseparable from the very essence of "*the flesh*"; we are still far from the conclusion that in the Apostle's mind "the flesh is by its nature and from the beginning the principle of sin" (Pfleiderer, p. 62).

We pass on to vii. 25: "*So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.*"

Here the form of the sentence distinguishes "the flesh" from "the sin" which gives law to it, as clearly as it distinguishes "the mind" from God whose law it serves. Sin in fact appears not as an essential property of the flesh, but as a power which has brought it into bondage.

The flesh thus ruled by sin becomes a chief source of opposition, not only to the better impulses of "the mind," but also to the law of God and to the influence of His Spirit. Hence it naturally becomes personified; and that which was a mere material substance, morally inert, is invested in the Apostle's thought with a spontaneous energy and a living will, with affections and lusts, that war not only against the soul, but against God, so that "*the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other*" (Gal. v. 17).

It is in this sense that "*the flesh*" is so often mentioned in Rom. viii. as a principle pervading all man's earthly life, and ruling it in opposition to all that is spiritual and Divine: compare the notes on viii. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13; xii. 14: also see the notes on vii. 14 (σάρκινος) and xv. 27 (σαρκικός).

The preceding references include every passage in the Epistle in which σάρξ and its derivatives occur. But one of these passages (viii. 3) requires to be further noticed.

Its true interpretation depends on our holding fast the original meaning of "*the flesh*" under every modification to which it is subjected in the Apostle's use. When it is said that the law



Digitized by Google

"*was weak through the flesh*," we see that St. Paul is regarding "*the flesh*" in that point of view which he has fully explained in vii. 14–25, that is to say, he regards "*the flesh*" not only as morally worthless, devoid of all good (vii. 18), but as positively opposed to the law which is spiritual (*v.* 14), and as exercising such dominion over man's whole life that while the mind consents unto the law that it is good (*v.* 16), the will is not able to give effect to its better impulses, but is forced, as it were, unwillingly to do that which the conscience hates (*v.* 15). Against this controlling power of "*the flesh*" the law was weak.

But God sent his own Son in the likeness of this same flesh, which had in all men become "**flesh of sin**." In our notes on this passage we have fully discussed the meaning of the expression "*likeness of* **flesh of sin**," and have, as we believe, proved that it does not by any means imply that Christ's own flesh was sinful. It may be well to state the opposite view in the words of one of its most able and moderate advocates: "By means of the πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, which constituted His personality (Rom. i. 4), Christ was free from personal sin; not merely from sinful actions, but from any personal inward experience whatsoever of sin as His own: He was one "*who knew no sin*," 2 Cor. v. 21. Notwithstanding this, He partook according to the flesh, or according to His outward man, of the universal human principle of sin, for He had as the material of His body *the same flesh of sin as all other men*" (Pfleiderer, 'Paulinism,' i. 152). This view is further connected, as we might expect, with a theory of Christ's pre-existent nature very different from that which St. Paul is usually supposed to teach. According to Pfleiderer Christ "was essentially and originally a heavenly man" (p. 132). He is the perfect image of God only so far as the Divine essence is "capable of manifestation." "But this being the very image of God is so far from being equal to Him, that on the contrary Christ's Lordship over the community and the world implies his unconditional subordination to God" (p. 135).

His being "*in the form of God*" (Phil. ii. 6) "by no means implies that He Himself was also God (Θεὸς ὁ λόγος); on the contrary, the Pauline notion of being in the image of God distinctly includes within itself that of being the pattern of humanity" (p. 138).

In this theory we see one of the necessary results of the writer's misinterpretation of the "*likeness of sinful flesh*:" if Christ's own flesh is assumed to be sinful, we can escape from the intolerable thought that sin was in the Manhood taken into God, only by denying the Godhead of the Son.

On the contrary hold fast throughout, as the same writer frequently insists, that "*the flesh*" is everywhere "the material substance of the body" (pp. 48, 49, 57), and be content to combine with this what the same author (p. 52) calls "the common Hebraic notion of σάρξ, according to which it signifies material substance which is void indeed of the spirit but not contrary to it, which is certainly weak and perishable, and so far unclean, but not positively evil,"—which in all men except Christ is corrupted and defiled by sin, but is neither sin itself, nor the original source of sin, nor in its essence sinful,—and so we can understand how Christ by taking our flesh in its pure essence without sin, and preserving its sinlessness in every stage of our earthly existence through life and unto death, "*condemned sin in the flesh*," condemned it as having no rightful place or power there, condemned it as an enemy to be by His help conquered and cast out.

The method of interpretation which we have now applied to every passage in which the word σάρξ occurs in the Epistle to the Romans is equally applicable to its use in other Epistles, and in the Bible generally. There is not, as we believe, a single passage which contains the doctrine that the flesh is the source of sin and essentially sinful,—a doctrine which dishonours not only man's nature, but the Father who created us, and the Son who for our redemption was made flesh, and dwelt among us.

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# ROMANS.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *Paul commendeth his calling to the Romans,* 9 *and his desire to come to them.* 16 *What his gospel is, and the righteousness which it sheweth.* 18 *God is angry with all manner of sin.* 21 *What were the sins of the Gentiles.*

PAUL, a servant of Jesus Christ, called *to be* an apostle, [a] separated unto the gospel of God,

[a] Acts 13. 2.

2 (Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,)

---

CHAP. I. 1–7. ADDRESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The form of salutation with which St. Paul begins his Epistles, is here enlarged by important statements concerning his Apostolic office, the nature of the Gospel, and the Person of Christ. This stately fulness in the opening address of the Epistle well befits the grandeur of its subject, and the dignity of a Church seated in the Imperial City, to which the writer was as yet unknown.

1. Official designation of the writer. St. Paul's first care, in addressing a church to which he is not personally known, is to shew by what authority he writes.

*servant of Jesus Christ.*] *Servant of* **Christ Jesus**: see note at the end of the chapter. The meaning of the title is not to be derived from the condition of the Greek slave: its Hebrew origin is clearly seen when St. James (i. 1) calls himself "*a Servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.*" In the Old Testament "*servant of God*" or "*servant of Jehovah*" is applied to all worshippers of the true God (Deut. xxxii. 36; 2 Kings x. 23; Dan. iii. 26), but more emphatically to those who are specially called to God's service, as Abraham, Moses, David, and the Prophets, and pre-eminently to the Messiah (Ps. cv. 42; Ex. xiv. 31; Ps. xviii. title; Isai. xlii. 1; Jer. vii. 25; Zech. iii. 8). See Ewald, 'History of Israel,' iii. p. 200, note. In the New Testament the corresponding title, "servant of Christ," is occasionally used of believers in general (1 Cor. vii. 22; Eph. vi. 6); but more frequently apostles love to appropriate to themselves a title so significant of entire devotion to a master who is also their Lord and God (Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1; James i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 1).

*called to be an apostle.*] **A called apostle.** In proof of his authority St. Paul now adds the more special designation of his office: he is an "*apostle*" in the full and proper sense, like the twelve whom Christ so named (Luke vi. 13), and, like them, not self-appointed, nor of man's choosing, but "*called,*" and sent by Christ himself (Gal. i. 1; Acts xxvi. 17, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε).

*separated.*] **Set apart.** The Divine call at Damascus, in which God's electing purpose was accomplished (Gal. i. 15), was the crisis in St. Paul's life which determined his future course: henceforward he was "*a chosen vessel to bear Christ's name before Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel*" (Acts ix. 15; xxii. 14, 15.) Thus he had been for ever "**set apart**" from other men not called to the same office, and from other pursuits, "*unto the gospel of God.*" "*Gospel*" means here the actual announcement, the living utterance of "glad tidings," not only the facts and doctrines contained in the gospel (see note on Mark i. 1, and 1 Cor. i. 17; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. iii. 2). Here, as in Gal. i. 6, 2 Cor. xi. 4, εὐαγγέλιον is used without the article, because St. Paul would indicate the nature and quality of the Gospel as a Divine message—"good tidings from God."

**2–5.** From himself and his office St. Paul passes on, with thoughts kindling and expanding at the mention of the Gospel, to declare its relation to ancient prophecy (*v.* 2), and its great subject, the Son of God, in His Incarnation (*v.* 3),

His Resurrection and Lordship (*v.* 4), and His manifestation to the world through His Apostles (*v.* 5).

**2, 3.** The connection with the previous

Digitized by Google

3 Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;

verse must not be interrupted by brackets, as in the Authorised Version: both sense and construction flow on—"the glad tidings of God which he promised concerning His Son."

The prophets foretell both the publication of the Gospel and its contents: "*the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem*" (Mic. iv. 2), "*O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength*" (Isai. xl. 9), "*How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace*" (Isai. lii. 7; Nah. i. 15). These are but a few out of many passages which foretell the future proclamation of a message from God, apart from any description of its contents. But St. Paul not only seeks to enhance the majesty of the Gospel as thus heralded by prophecy; he also calls God's chief ambassadors "*his prophets*," as witnesses to the truth of its contents.

For in *vv.* 3, 4 he brings forward two historic facts of paramount importance, which identify the Son concerning whom glad tidings were promised with Jesus whom Paul preaches. The prophets speak of One who *is to be* born of the seed of David (Ps. lxxxix. 36; Jer. xxiii. 5), and *is to be* raised from the dead (Ps. ii. 7; xvi. 10; Acts ii. 25–32; xiii. 32–37); the Gospel tells of Him who *was* born and *was* raised. That these two facts form the very foundation of St. Paul's teaching is clear from this passage and 2 Tim. ii. 8: "*Remember* **Jesus Christ raised from the dead, of the seed of David**, *according to my gospel.*" Compare Acts xiii. 23, 30.

*in the holy Scriptures.*] **In holy** *scriptures* (Wiclif). The books of the Prophets are "holy writings," being the records of Divine revelation. Compare xvi. 26.

*Concerning his Son.*] The essence of the Gospel, as divinely imparted to St. Paul (Gal. i. 16) and preached by him (2 Cor. i. 19), was the revelation of "the Son of God," "his own Son" (viii. 3, compare viii. 32, ἰδίου, and Col. i. 13–17; Phil. ii. 6). St. Paul seems never to have applied the title "Son of God" to Christ in any other than the highest sense, certainly not here, where the Son of God is declared to be the one great subject of the Gospel and of Prophecy. See on *v.* 4.

*which was made, &c.*] In order to fulfil that which had been promised concerning Him, the Eternal Son must both become the Son of Man and be manifested as the Son of God. For this cause He "*was made, or* **born**, *of the seed of David;*" an expression which points to Christ's human birth "as derived from the greatest of Israel's kings, and in fulfilment of the sure word of prophecy" (Ellicott, 2 Tim. ii. 8). Compare John vii. 42, "*Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David?*" Meyer, Reuss, and others try to represent St. Paul's words as inconsistent with the supernatural generation of Jesus. But that Mary, as well as Joseph, was of the lineage of David is clearly implied in the history of the Annunciation, recorded by St. Paul's constant companion, St. Luke, ch. i. 31–35: see note there. Thus, while Jesus was the Son of David according to the customary and legal view, "*being as was supposed the son of Joseph*," He was at the same time, by actual descent, "*of the fruit of David's body*" (Ps. cxxxii. 11, 12).

Into these distinctions, however, St. Paul does not here enter: he states that which according to either view is true, and which is everywhere regarded as a notorious fact in the Gospel history, that Jesus "was descended from David" (Matt. ix. 27; xv. 22; xx. 30, 31; xxi. 9). See notes on Matt. i. 16, 18.

The importance of St. Paul's testimony to the Davidic descent of Jesus is greatly enhanced by the fact that Gamaliel, at whose feet he was brought up, being grandson of the great Hillel, was himself of the house and lineage of David.

For as Christ must be the Son of David, the first and simplest test of the claims of Jesus was his descent; and this was a matter most easily and surely ascertained by a reference to genealogies so carefully kept as those of the royal family of Judah. Had the slightest shadow of doubt ever been cast upon the descent of Jesus from David, it must have been known to Gamaliel: and his disciple Saul could never have accepted as the Messiah one whose claim to a place in the royal lineage, which Gamaliel shared, was false or doubtful. See Taanith, cap. iv. § 2: "Rabbi Levi saith: They found a roll of genealogies at Jerusalem, in which was written, Hillel from David."

*according to the flesh.*] **As to** *the flesh.* The sense is the same as in ch. ix. 5, "*of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came.*" In Gal. iv. 23, 29, the words κατὰ σάρκα, κατὰ πνεῦμα, *after the flesh*, and *after the Spirit*, are used in a sense quite different from that in which they are here applied to Christ's flesh and Spirit.

"*Flesh*" in its limited and proper sense denotes the material substance of the living body, but its signification in Scripture is much more extensive and varied: see note on vii. 5. As denoting human nature on that side of

Digitized by Google

[Gr. *determined*.]

4 And [1]declared *to be* the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

---

which our senses take direct cognizance, it is most appropriate here, where the purpose is to declare that Christ was truly man.

**4.** *And declared, &c.*] A higher aspect of Christ's nature is now presented in a second clause set side by side with the former, and rendered emphatic by the absence of any conjunction, and by an exact repetition of the same form:

"*Which was* **born** *of the seed of David*—
**Which was designated** *the Son of God.*"

*declared.*] The Greek word (ὁρισθέντος) means either "defined" mentally, as in logic, (Xen. *Mem.* IV. vi. 4, 6) or "**designated**" actually: the latter sense, which is closely connected with that of "instituting," "appointing," or "ordaining," is the only sense which the word has in the New Test. (see Acts x. 42; xvii. 31).

*the Son of God.*] Bishop Pearson, 'Creed,' Art. ii., shews that Christ is so called (besides other reasons) because He is raised by God immediately out of the earth unto immortal life, because after His Resurrection He is made actually Heir of all things, but above all because He was begotten of the Father before all worlds.

The direct and proper proof of this last meaning of the title is the express teaching of Christ and His Apostles: yet even in this sense He was indirectly proved by the Resurrection to be the Son of God.

For the resurrection was (1st) a signal manifestation of Divine power (whether exercised by Christ Himself, or by the Father in his behalf); and therefore (2ndly) a testimony to the truth of Him Who claimed to be "the Son of God;" and also (3rdly) according to St. Paul's preaching, in Acts xiii. 33, it was the prophetic sign which God had set upon His Son in the second Psalm. By it, therefore, He was marked out, or designated, as the Son of God. "Although His precepts, His miracles, His character, His express language, all pointed to the truth of His Godhead, the conscience of mankind was not laid under a formal obligation to acknowledge It, until at length He had been defined to be *the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead*" (Liddon, 'Bampton Lect.' p. 60).

We must add that the resurrection of Jesus not only proved and shewed what He was, but also wrought an actual change in the mode of His existence (Godet). For He who in the Incarnation became One Christ, by taking of the Manhood into God, by His resurrection entered *for the first time as the One Christ both God and Man* into the glory of the Son of God. Thus was He (in Pearson's words) "defined or constituted and appointed the Son of God" ('Creed,' Art. ii.).

*with power.*] By the resurrection Christ was designated '*with power*' as Son of God, because power was the Divine attribute preeminently displayed therein. So St. Paul speaks, in Eph. i. 19, of "*the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power* (lit. **of the might of his strength**), *which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.*"

*according to the spirit of holiness.*] The phrases **as to** *the flesh*—**as to** *the Spirit* are so strictly parallel, that the second must necessarily represent, as the first does, a constituent part of Christ's own being.

Moreover, the peculiar phrase "*Spirit of holiness,*" found only in this passage, is evidently chosen to distinguish the holy spiritual nature of Christ from "*the Holy Spirit,*" who is the Third Person of the Trinity. See Note at the end of the Chapter.

The two clauses thus present two sides or aspects of the One Incarnate Son of God; the "*flesh*" that side on which He is visibly one with us, "very man," "born of a woman:" "*the Spirit of holiness,*" that side on which He —the same Son of Man—is proved by the resurrection to be the Son of God.

This "*Spirit of holiness*" (whether with older interpreters we take it to mean the essential Deity of Christ, or, as seems to be more exact, the Spirit at once Divine and human of the Incarnate Son) was in either case the sphere and organ of His Divine power. In it He triumphed over death: see 1 Pet. iii. 18, "*being put to death in (the) flesh, but quickened* **in** *(the) Spirit,*"—a passage which confirms the meaning we have given to "flesh" and "Spirit."

*by the resurrection from the dead.*] Read, **of the dead.** St. Paul never uses the expression "resurrection from the dead," but "**of** the dead" (plural). See Acts xvii. 32; xxiv. 15, 21.

So in Acts xxvi. 23. St. Paul speaks of Christ as the "**first from the resurrection of the dead**" (plural).

Christ's rising was a "**resurrection of the dead**" (plural), because in Him the general hope of mankind received a first fulfilment. Others had been raised by Prophets of old, and by Christ Himself, but only to die again: "*Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more.*"

Digitized by Google

5 By whom we have received grace and apostleship, [1]for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name:

6 Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ:

7 To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called *to be* saints:

[1] Or, *to the obedience of faith.*

---

*Jesus Christ our Lord.*] In the authorized version these words are wrongly placed in *v.* 3, after "*his Son.*" Their right position is at the end of *v.* 4. The Son of David and Son of God is thus finally described by three well-known titles; "*Jesus*" which identifies Him as the crucified Saviour, "*Christ*" the promised Messiah, "*our Lord*" the exalted King, to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth.

5. *By whom we have received.*] Rather, "**Through whom we received** *grace and Apostleship.*" From the mention of Christ as "*Our Lord,*" St. Paul takes opportunity to describe more fully than in *v.* 1 the authority which he had received from Him as "*head over all things to the Church*" (Eph. i. 22). Thus from the majesty of Christ's Person he tacitly implies the dignity of the Apostolic office.

The plural here is most appropriate, for by it St. Paul asserts his own authority in a form which does not exclude, though it does not expressly include, the other Apostles. Thus, in addressing a Church which no Apostle had yet visited, he happily ignores any distinction of authority by using the indefinite plural: on the other hand in Gal. ii. 8, 9 observe how carefully he asserts his own individual claim, even to the exclusion of Barnabas.

St. Paul often speaks of his call to apostleship as "*the grace that was given*" to him by God (Rom. xv. 15, 16; Gal. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 7–9). But we must not on that account take the two terms together as equivalent to the "grace of apostleship," nor yet entirely separate them as if St. Paul had first received the personal grace of salvation, which is common to all believers and then afterwards been called to the Apostolic office: the two moments were in him united, and the "*grace*" of which all partake was enhanced in his case by the special gift of "*apostleship.*" From being "*a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious*" (1 Tim. i. 13), he was called at once to "*preach the faith which once he destroyed*" (Gal. i. 23). Thus the sense of his unworthiness mingling with every thought of his Apostolic office makes it to himself the great memorial of God's exceeding mercy: "*Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ*" (Eph. iii. 8).

*for obedience to the faith.*] Render, *for obedience* **to faith**: not, as in Acts vi. 7, "*to the faith,*" *i.e.* to the gospel or doctrine of the faith, for the Greek Article is here omitted.

"*obedience* **to faith**" is man's surrender of himself in mind and heart to faith as the principle and power, "the organic law," of the new life in Christ.

Margin, "*to the obedience of faith.*" But the meaning "*obedience* **to faith**" is confirmed by the similar phrases *obedient to the faith* (Acts vi. 7), "*obey the Gospel*" (Rom. x. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8), and the construction of the genitive is not unusual: compare "*in obeying the truth,*" lit. "**in the obedience of the truth**" (1 Pet. i. 22), and "*the obedience of* (*i.e.* **to**) *Christ*" (2 Cor. x. 5).

*among all nations.*] St. Paul's original commission, of which he is here speaking, embraced both Jews and Gentiles (Acts ix. 15; xxvi. 17, 20): and though special prominence is given both in this Epistle (i. 13; xi. 13; xv. 16) and elsewhere (Acts xxii. 15 and 21; Gal. i. 16) to his mission to the Gentiles, yet here in the salutation it is more natural that his Apostolic office should be set forth in its fullest extent, and its dignity enhanced by the world-wide purpose for which it was bestowed. The actual association of Jews and Gentiles in the Church of Rome, and the desire to unite them in closer bonds of Christian fellowship, required that both should be included in the address. These considerations are confirmed by the usage of the words in the N. T. For though ἔθνη and τὰ ἔθνη commonly mean Gentiles as distinguished from Jews, the expression πάντα τὰ ἔθνη retains the fuller sense in which it is first employed, in the blessing of Abraham, Gen. xviii. 18, xxii. 18.

*for his name.*] Or, "**for his name's sake.**" The end and purpose of "*obedience to faith among all nations*" is to promote the glory of Christ, that "**in** *his name every knee should bow,*" and "*every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*" (Phil. ii. 10: compare Acts v. 41; ix. 15, 16; xxi. 13).

6. *Among whom are ye also.*] Having described his commission in *v.* 5 as embracing all nations, the Apostle now expressly tells his readers at Rome that they are included in it, implying thereby that he has authority to address them.

*the called of Jesus Christ.*] More literally "Jesus Christ's called ones:" compare the expression "God's elect" (viii. 33), and "Israel, my called" (Isai. xlviii. 12). Christ's "called"

Digitized by Google

Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

8 First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.

---

are those who belong to Him as having been called by God the Father, to whom the act of calling is always ascribed.

By adding this description of those whom he addresses, St. Paul, while asserting his own authority, at the same time recognizes their position as being already members of Christ's Church.

**7.** Through the crowd of thoughts which had pressed in upon his mind with the first mention of the Gospel, *v.* 1, St. Paul has now come back to the direct relation between himself and his readers, and so proceeds to address his letter to them, and concludes the address with his usual salutation.

*To all that be in Rome, beloved of God.*] Rather, "**To all God's beloved that are in Rome.**" The direct connection is with *v.* 1: "*Paul . . . to all God's beloved.*" God's people are called in the O. T. "*his beloved*" (Ps. lx. 5; cviii. 6; cxxvii. 2): St. Paul applies the term to Israel in ch. xi. 28, and to Christians in general, 1 Tim. vi. 2. One bond between the Apostle and his readers is that they are in common the objects of God's love, a second their common consecration to His service as **called saints** (Godet).

On the omission of the words "*in Rome*," in G. g, see Introduction, § 8.

*called to be saints.*] Lit. "**called saints.**" Compare *v.* 1: "**a called Apostle.**" "God's beloved" are also His "*called saints*," separated by the Divine call from the world, and made a holy or consecrated people; like Israel of old (Ex. xix. 5, 6), they are not simply "*called* to be *holy*" (A. V.), nor "called because holy," but "holy because called" (Augustine). The holiness is not primarily that of individual moral character, but that of consecration to God's service, and is therefore ascribed to all Christians, who are, however, bound by this very consecration to personal holiness of life. See note on viii. 30.

*Grace to you and peace.*] The form of address most usual in a Greek letter is seen in Acts xv. 23; xxiii. 26; James i. 1. But the "joy," or "health," or "prosperity" was sometimes omitted, and nothing written but the names and descriptions of the writer and reader. St. Paul having adopted this shortened form of address, now adds to it an independent sentence containing an essentially Christian salutation, in which "*grace*" is the Divine love manifesting itself towards sinful man in free forgiveness and unmerited blessing, and "*peace*," the gift of God's grace, is the actual state of reconciliation: see note on *v.* 1. "For when through grace sins have been forgiven and enmity done away, it remains for us to be joined in peace to Him from whom our sins alone did separate us" (Augustine). The fuller form found in the Pastoral Epistles, "*Grace, mercy, and peace*," confirms the interpretation which thus gives to "*grace*" (χάρις) and "*peace*" a fulness of meaning not found in the Greek χαίρειν or the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם.

*from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.*] The original source of "*grace and peace*" is "*God our Father*," who has made us His children by adoption (viii. 15); the nearer source from which they flow to us is "*the Lord Jesus Christ*" as Head of the Church. It is clear from the salutations in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, where the sentence is completed, "grace . . . . be multiplied," that St. Paul's salutation also must be understood as a benediction or prayer. Thus in the apostolic letters the forms of common life are hallowed by Christian love, and a passing courtesy is transformed into a prayer for heavenly blessings.

### 8–15. INTRODUCTION.

The salutation (1–7), which declares St. Paul's official relation to the Christians at Rome, is followed by a brief introductory statement of his personal feelings towards them, in which he declares his thankfulness for their faith (*v.* 8), his remembrance of them in prayer (*v.* 9), and his desire to visit them and to labour among them in preaching the Gospel (10–15).

**8.** *First I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all.*] The thanksgiving, with which the Apostle begins this and most of his epistles, is not to be ascribed to mere rhetorical art or courteous tact in winning the good will of his readers, nor to any fond lingering over an ideal picture of a perfect Church. That for which St. Paul gives thanks to God is no imaginary excellence, but the *fact* that everywhere, in the Churches which he visits, he hears tidings of the faith of those who have embraced the Gospel in Rome. The instinct of love leads him to touch first on that which is thankworthy in his brethren: "It was meet to make a prelude with thanksgiving" (Œcumenius), because they not only believed, but so openly declared their belief, that it was published throughout the whole world. Observe that the Apostle does not praise them for their faith; it is too divine and excellent a gift for praise. "The greatest

Digitized by Google

9 For God is my witness, whom I serve [1]with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers;

10 Making request, if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God to come unto you.

11 For I long to see you, that I

[1] Or, *in my spirit.*

---

blessings call not for praise, but for something greater and better" (Aristot., 'Nic. Eth.,' I. xii. 4); and St. Paul gives solemn thanks to God for his brethren's faith.

*for you all.*] See note on the reading at end of chapter. He regards their faith as a gift to himself, for which he is bound to give thanks to God: see 2 Thess. i. 3; ii. 13.

It is this feeling of personal interest in their welfare that prompts the loving, trustful word, "*my God,*" that is, "the God who has given me a fresh proof of His love in your faith." Compare Phil. iv. 19.

*through Jesus Christ.*] "To render thanks to God is to offer a sacrifice of praise: and therefore he adds '*through Jesus Christ,*' as through the great High Priest." (Origen.)

Meyer argues that Christ is the Mediator of thanksgiving only as the causal agent of the blessings for which thanks are given, and not as the Mediating Offerer. But that the thanksgiving itself is offered through Christ is certainly the view presented in 1 Pet. ii. 5: "*to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.*" Equally clear is the meaning of Heb. xiii. 15, Col. iii. 17, and Ephes. v. 20. We must therefore retain the earlier and more usual interpretation that St. Paul gives thanks *through Jesus Christ*, not only because the particular blessing flows from Him, and not only because by Him alone we are brought into such a relation to God that we can offer Him thanksgiving, but because our thanksgiving itself and "All our services need to be cleansed and hallowed by passing through the hands of our most holy and undefiled High Priest, to become sweet and savoury (or to receive that ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας which St. Paul speaks of), from being offered up in His Censer." (Barrow, 'Sermon on Col.' iii. 17).

**9.** *For God is my witness.*] St. Paul confirms the sincerity of his thanksgiving for the Christians at Rome by declaring his constant remembrance of them in prayer (*v.* 9), and his longing desire to see them (*v.* 10). This declaration he introduces by a very solemn appeal to God as witness of its truth (2 Cor. xi. 31; Phil. i. 8). Is such language too strong for the occasion? Is St. Paul, as some have thought, so carried away by the intensity of his feelings, or the fervid style of his age and country, or any other cause, as to invoke the name of God thus solemnly without an urgent reason? Or does he speak the words of truth and soberness? We must remember that the Apostle is writing from Corinth, where his sincerity was recently called in question, because his visit to that church had been postponed: to that charge he gave a full and deliberate refutation (2 Cor. i. 15–24), in the course of which (*v.* 23) he used even a stronger protestation than in the passage before us. Moreover, he is writing on the eve of undertaking a journey from Corinth—a city comparatively near Rome—to Jerusalem, which was far distant. He thus appears to be turning his back upon the Romans, just when it seems most natural to pay his long intended visit; and he has therefore reason to fear lest he should be suspected of fickleness or insincerity, or even of being ashamed to preach the Gospel in the great centre of learning and civilization.

At present he cannot prove his sincerity, he can only assert it; he cannot show what is in his heart, he can only call the heart-searching God to witness.

*whom I serve with my spirit.*] He whose servant and minister I am, to whom I offer no mere outward service in preaching the Gospel of His Son, but therein serve and worship Him in my spirit (xv. 16),—He is my witness that I long and pray to do His work among you (2 Tim. i. 3). He knoweth "*that* or (rather **how**) *without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers*" (Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3, 4).

**10.** *Making request, &c.*] *Making request if by any means* **I shall ever at length be prospered in** *the will of God to come unto you.* How beautifully the Apostle's language reflects the inward conflict of his feelings! The remembrance of past hindrances is combined with the foresight of future difficulties, and the eagerness of desire is tempered by resignation to the will of God, who will bring all to a prosperous issue in His own way, and at His own time.

The combination ἤδη ποτὲ with a Future assigns to a long-expected event an early (ἤδη) but uncertain date (ποτέ). Compare Viger 'de Idiotismis Gr.' p. 413; Phil. iv. 10; Aristoph. 'Ranae' 931.

**be prospered.**] See 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 3 John 2; and compare the use of the same word in LXX 2 Chron. xiii. 12; Ps. i. 3; Prov. xvii. 8 (Meyer).

**11.** *For I long to see you.*] The reason of

Digitized by Google

may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established;

12 That is, that I may be comforted together [1]with you by the mutual faith both of you and me.

[1] Or, in you.

13 Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was let hitherto,) that I might have some fruit [1]among you also, even as among other Gentiles.

[1] Or, in you.

---

his earnest prayer is the desire to see, face to face, his brethren at Rome, in whose welfare he is already deeply interested. Compare xv. 23, and notes there.

The word "I long" (ἐπιποθῶ) expresses both the desire that draws him to them, and his regret that he has not been able to come sooner (Godet).

*some spiritual gift.*] The word "charisma" is never used in the N.T. of a gift from man, but may be applied to anything which comes from God's free *grace*, whether it be a providential deliverance from death (2 Cor. i. 11), a moral virtue, as continence (1 Cor. vii. 7), God's favour to Israel (Rom. xi. 29), the gift of eternal life in Christ Jesus (v. 15, 16; vi. 23), or any of the manifold gifts of the Spirit (xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 4), whether miraculous (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10), ministerial (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6), or simply personal, as faith (1 Cor. xii. 9). A gift of this last kind is here meant. St. Paul hopes that in Rome, as elsewhere, his personal ministry may be attended with some gift of God's Holy Spirit, that may confirm and strengthen his brethren in the principles and practice of the Christian life. Increase of knowledge, love, or hope, or of all these combined, would be such a Spiritual gift; but the next verse shews that the strengthening of faith is foremost in the Apostle's thoughts. Such a gift is called *spiritual*, not as pertaining to man's spirit, but as proceeding from the Spirit of God. St. Paul can impart it only because he has received "grace and apostleship," for this very purpose. Compare xv. 29.

12. *That is, that I may be comforted together with you.*] A beautiful example of St. Paul's humility! He never forgets that those whom he addresses are Christians as well as himself. At the very outset he gives thanks to God for their well-known faith; and here he does not say "that I may establish you," but "*that ye may be established*," namely by God. But, lest even thus he should seem to represent the benefit of his visit as all on their side, he hastens to correct his expression, and to place himself beside them, as sharing in the benefit of mutual comfort. He drops the idea of their needing to be established as persons weak in faith, and joins himself with them as needing to be encouraged by their faith, no less than they by his; for by "mutual faith," is here meant "the faith which each sees in the other." The whole verse may be thus rendered:—**That is; that we may be together comforted among you each by the other's faith, yours as well as mine.** For the construction, see note at end of chapter.

13. *Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren.*] St. Paul's usual mode of announcing some new and important point (see note on xi. 25). His first thought has been of the present and future welfare of his readers (*vv.* 8–12): he is thankful for their faith, and longs to help in establishing it. But then comes the question, Why has he never yet visited them? and if this be not answered, it may throw doubt upon the sincerity of his present profession. He therefore assures them that he not only now longs to see them, but has often actually formed the purpose of coming to them.

(*but was let hitherto*).] "**And I was hindered until now.**" "Again he shows his love in another way. For neither when I was hindered, says he, did I cease from the attempt, but was always attempting and always hindered and never desisting" (Chrysostom).

The nature of the hindrances is explained afterwards, xv. 22: here the Apostle only alludes to them in a brief parenthesis, lest he should seem to have changed his purpose lightly, and so hastens on to the motive of his oft-intended visit.

*that I might have some fruit.*] The same modesty, which is so conspicuous in *vv.* 11 12, may be traced again in the words "*some*" and "*fruit.*" The emphasis is on "*some*" (τινα) which here, though not usually, stands first. The good which St. Paul hoped to do among them, whether much or little, he represents as a benefit to himself. In any increase of their faith and holiness and good works, he would reap a harvest to reward his labour (compare vi. 22; Phil. iv. 17, and Joh. iv. 35–38). See note at end of chapter.

*among you also, even as among other Gentiles.*] Read, **the rest of the Gentiles.** The "*you*" can only mean here, as throughout the context, the Christians at Rome;

Digitized by Google

14 I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise.

15 So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

17 For therein is the righteous-

---

for the letter is addressed to them, and not to all the people of Rome. It is thus clear from the expression "*you also*"—"*the rest of the Gentiles*," that the Christians at Rome were, in the mass, Gentiles. They thus belonged to "the Apostle of the Gentiles," though as yet unvisited by him, Col. ii. 1.

**14.** *I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise.*] **Both to Greeks and Barbarians, both to wise and unwise I am debtor.**

Nations may differ in language and civilization as "*Greeks and Barbarians*," and men may differ in intelligence as "*wise and unwise*:" but all alike are included in the sphere of Apostolic duty, because the relation in which men stand to Christ and His Gospel is deeper and more essential than all national and personal distinctions. The Son of Man "rises above the parentage, the blood, the narrow horizon which bounded as it seemed His Human Life; He is the Archetypal Man in Whose presence distinctions of race, intervals of ages, types of civilization, degrees of mental culture, are as nothing" (Liddon, 'Bampton Lectures,' p. 12).

It is asked, in which class does St. Paul mean to place the Romans. And Lange answers that the Romans are included with the Greeks as having the same culture, and that Jews and Greeks are comprehended in the term "*wise*." Such questions should neither be asked nor answered: they show a complete misconception of the Apostle's meaning, by trying to establish the very distinctions which he seeks to exclude. On the nationality of the Christians at Rome, see Introduction, § 3.

*I am debtor.*] St. Paul sees in his commission to preach the Gospel to all nations a debt that must be paid, or as he calls it in 1 Cor. ix. 16–19, a necessity laid on him, and a stewardship entrusted to him.

**15.** *So, as much as in me is, I am ready.*] **Thus I for my part** *am ready*. In accordance with this duty, which I owe to all nations, I am ready so far as it depends on me to preach the Gospel **to you also that are in Rome**. I have been hindered, and, if such is God's will, may be hindered again; but there is no lack of willingness or zeal on my part. The grammatical construction and exact rendering of the verse are discussed in the note at end of chapter.

*you ... also.*] See on *v.* 13. Here the description "*you that are* **in** *Rome*," shows that St. Paul is thinking of the Christian Church as set in the midst of that great city in which "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" were now concentrated, and which was also "The common sink of all the worst vices of humanity, and therefore the noblest sphere for Evangelic zeal" (Lightfoot, Phil. p. 13).

On the omission of ἐν Ῥώμῃ in G. g, here and in *v.* 7, see Introduction § 8.

Vv. 16, 17. Theme of the Epistle.

**16.** *For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.*] "*Of Christ*" must be omitted, with the best MSS. Though St. Paul is directly addressing the Christians at Rome, it is not possible that he, the Apostle of the Gentiles, could think of preaching the Gospel there to that little band of believers only. The mention of Rome suggests the thought of coming face to face with the mighty power concentrated in that stronghold of Heathendom, and with the vast multitudes there gathered together out of every nation under heaven. It is this thought that speaks in the words, "*I am not ashamea of the Gospel*," which form the transition from the introduction to the theme of the Epistle.

The treatment which St. Paul had experienced in other great cities, such as Athens, Ephesus and Corinth (whence he was now writing), might well have daunted any less steadfast soul; even he feels the full contrast between the power and pomp and splendour of "the capital and theatre of the world" and the seeming weakness and folly of the Cross: and yet he is not ashamed to preach even in Rome the doctrine of a crucified Saviour.

*for it is the power of God unto salvation.*] Compare 1 Cor. i. 24. The Gospel, in all its seeming weakness, is in fact "*the power of God*;" not simply a statement of God's power, nor a mere instrument which God's power uses, but God's living revelation of Himself, a Divine power flowing forth from Him to save men's souls (James i. 21).

Some have seen in this sentence a theoretical definition of the Gospel: but St. Paul is stating a fact of his own experience. He has felt this "*power of God*" in himself, he has

Digitized by Google

ness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, [a]The just shall live by faith.

[a] Hab. 2. 4.

18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men,

---

witnessed its effect on others, and has seen it shed life and joy around him, as often as it touched believing hearts.

*to every one that believeth.*] The saving efficacy of God's power is limited by faith as a condition which God himself imposes, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with the essential dignity of man's moral nature. Physical force acting upon matter has an invariable and necessary effect: moral or spiritual power varies in its effect with the free response of the spirit on which it acts. Thus the offer of salvation is the same to all: it is effectual in those who willingly accept it, and that willing acceptance is faith.

*to the Jew first.*] The Gospel as the power of God unto salvation is needful to Jew as well as Gentile: this is the point proved in ii. 1—iii. 20. Nor is there any distinction between them as to the one condition, faith, (x. 11, 12). But the word of God must be spoken "to the Jew first" (Acts xiii. 46), as having priority in "the covenants of promise;" "and also to the Greek," *i.e.* to any one who is not a Jew. St. Paul always puts the Jew first in privilege, and first in responsibility (ii. 9, 10); so St. Peter on the day of Pentecost,—"the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off" (Acts ii. 39).

17. The description of the Gospel given in *v.* 16 is further explained and confirmed in each of its essential parts. The Gospel is a "*power unto salvation,*" for a "*righteousness*" which is in effect life and salvation is revealed in it.

It is "*God's power,*" for the righteousness revealed in it is "*of God.*"

It is for "every one *that believeth,*" for righteousness is revealed "from *faith* to faith."

All this is confirmed as being in accordance with the declaration of God's counsel in Habakkuk ii. 4, which promises *life, i.e. salvation*, to the *righteous* by *faith.*

St. Paul has thus passed by an easy and natural transition from the personal matters which form his introduction to a statement of the great doctrine which is the theme of the first eight chapters of the Epistle.

*therein is the righteousness of God revealed.*] Compare Ps. xcviii. 2, "*The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath be openly shewed* (Marg. '**revealed**,' Sept. ἀπεκάλυψεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, Vulg. 'revelavit') *in the sight of the heathen.*" St. Paul's reference to this passage is made evident by his adoption in *vv.* 16, 17 of the Psalmist's three chief words, "*salvation,*" "*righteousness,*" "*revealed,*" and of the parallelism between "*salvation*" (*v.* 16) and "*righteousness*" (*v.* 17).

*the righteousness of God.*] Rather "**a righteousness of God.**" This term occurring in a summary statement of the great theme of the Epistle is more likely to be used in a comprehensive than in a restricted sense. We must therefore be content, at present, to define its meaning only so far as it is determined by the form of the expression, by the immediate context, and by St. Paul's *previous* usage. We thus find that it is a righteousness having God as its author, and man as its recipient, who by it becomes righteous: its effect is salvation, and its condition faith: it is embodied first in the person of Christ "*who* **is made unto us wisdom from God,** *and righteousness*" (1 Cor. i. 30), and it is bestowed on us because of Christ's redeeming work, wherein He "was made sin for us, *that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*" (2 Cor. v. 21). See more in notes on iii. 21–25.

*revealed from faith to faith.*] This is the only connection permitted by the order of the words, and it teaches us that, so far as man is concerned, the revelation of the righteousness of God begins from and leads on to faith. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 18, *from glory to glory.* To the man who listens to the Gospel without faith, the righteousness of God is not therein revealed, but remains hidden: to him who listens with faith, the righteousness of God begins to be therein revealed, and its progressive revelation tends to produce a higher degree of faith as its result. Thus "*to every one that believeth*" the Gospel becomes by this revelation of the righteousness of God a "*power of God unto salvation,*" because by faith man embraces as his own the righteousness revealed to him.

*The just shall live by faith.*] This connection "*shall live by faith*" is required in the Hebrew of Hab. ii. 4, and corresponds best with St. Paul's application of the passage: for he does not say that "righteousness by faith is revealed," but that "*righteousness is revealed from faith to faith,*" and as the righteousness revealed and appropriated by faith is the power of God unto salvation, "the righteous shall live—*i.e.*, shall find life—by faith." Compare Gal. ii. 20, "*the life which I now live in the flesh I live by* (rather **in**) *the faith of the Son of God,*" &c. See notes on Hab. ii. 4, and note at end of chapter.

Digitized by Google

who hold the truth in unrighteousness;

19 Because that which may be known of God is manifest [1]in them; for God hath shewed *it* unto them.

20 For the invisible things of him

[1] Or, *to them.*

---

*faith.*] The Hebrew word so rendered means properly "steadfastness," "faithfulness," "fidelity," "trustiness," rather than the active "trustfulness"; *i.e.*, it means the faith which may be relied on, rather than the faith which relies. "But it will at times approach near to the active sense: for constancy under temptation or danger with an Israelite could only spring from reliance on Jehovah. And something of this transitional or double sense it has in Hab. ii. 4." (Lightfoot, Gal. iii. 11.)

CHAP. I. 18—III. 20. THE UNRIGHTEOUSNESS OF MAN.

St. Paul here enters upon the proof of his great theme, that both for Jew and Gentile salvation is only to be found in the revelation of the righteousness of God by faith.

First he shows, as a matter of fact and experience, that neither Gentile (i. 18–32) nor Jew (ch. ii.) has any righteousness of his own by which he can be justified before God; then, after answering objections relating to the case of the Jew (iii. 1–8), he confirms the testimony of experience by the declarations of God's word (iii. 9–20).

**18-32.** St. Paul here gives us, not a history, but a Christian philosophy of history: he is not narrating the growth of idolatry and vice in this or that nation, but showing in a broad generalized view the condition of the heathen world and the causes of its corruption.

The allusions to specific forms of vice and idolatry show plainly that he is describing the heathen; but the principles which he lays down, being of universal application, involve the Jew also in like condemnation, as is seen in ch. ii.

*the wrath of God is revealed from heaven.*] "An exordium terrible as lightning" (Melanchthon) is formed by the sudden and striking contrast to the preceding verses. There is a twofold revelation: in the one is seen a "power of God unto salvation," in the other, the destroying power of God's wrath: there the righteousness of God, here the unrighteousness of man.

Righteousness is revealed in the Gospel; wrath is revealed "*from heaven,*" because there "the Lord hath prepared his throne" (Ps. ix. 7; xi. 4), and thence "*His judgments* **go forth as the lightning**" (Hosea vi. 5, and note there). The power unto salvation is for "*every one that believeth*"; the wrath is against them "*that* **hold down** *the truth in unrighteousness*" (ch. vii. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 6). The meaning of this verse is more fully explained in the passage which follows. We there see that "*the truth*" means the knowledge of God (*vv.* 19 and 25), and that the wilful suppression of this truth struggling in the heart is what aggravates the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, leaving them without excuse. We see also *how* the wrath of God is revealed, namely, in the debasing vices and conscious misery to which the sinner is given over (24–32).

*ungodliness and unrighteousness.*] *I.e.* impiety and immorality, are both regarded as sins against God. "*Ungodliness*" is the stronger expression, but "*unrighteousness*" the more comprehensive and general (Aristotle, περὶ ἀρετῶν, vii. 1; Polit. III. c. 13, 3): this latter alone is repeated in the following clause, whence the ideal order of development is seen to be (1) unrighteousness, (2) suppression of the truth concerning God, (3) ungodliness and increased unrighteousness.

**19.** *Because, &c.*] The cause of God's wrath implied in the close of *v.* 18 is here distinctly stated, that men have a knowledge of God which they wilfully suppress, and so leave themselves without excuse.

*that which may be known of God.*] The word τὸ γνωστόν occurs nowhere else in St. Paul's epistles; but in Acts xiii. 38 and xxviii. 28, where St. Paul is the speaker, it is used, as in the N. T. generally, in a less precise sense—"known," "notable," or "notorious." Here, however, the whole context rises into the region of Christian philosophy, and our translators have done well in rendering the word more strictly. See Fritzsche, and Grimm, 'Clavis N. T. Philolog.'

*That which may be known* must not, however, be pressed to mean all that can possibly be known; but, as the next verse plainly shews, it means that knowledge of God which is or which may be gained by man's natural faculties exercised upon God's manifestation of Himself in creation.

*is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.*] Rather, "*for God* **manifested it to them.**"

"*In them*" does not mean "among them," as though this knowledge were limited to a few of the wise and learned, nor "in their consciousness" (Meyer), but "*in them*" as being what they are, in their very nature and constitution as men. If men had not a faculty to receive "*that which may be known of God,*"

Digitized by Google

from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; [1]so that they are without excuse:

[1] Or, *that they may be.*

21 Because that, when they knew

---

He could not be said to have manifested it "**to them.**" The verse, therefore, teaches that there is both an external manifestation of God to men, and a faculty in them to receive it; and these are the two ideas that are developed in the next verse.

Calvin's note is striking: "In saying that *God manifested it*, he means that the purpose for which man is created is to be the spectator of the fabric of the world; the purpose for which eyes have been given him is that by gazing on so fair an image he may be led on to its Author."

**20.** Explanation of the statement, "*God* **manifested it to them.**"

*the invisible things of him.*] St. Paul puts in the foremost place the invisible nature of God's attributes, just because men sinned by substituting visible images for His invisible perfections. The plural represents the invisible nature of God in its manifold properties, as explained by what follows.

*from the creation of the world.*] Most modern interpreters understand this merely as a mark of time, "since the creation." See note at end of chapter. But the older interpretation has more force, and is not really liable to the charge of tautology. "The creation of the world," viewed as a whole, is first presented as the *source* from which man derives a knowledge of the unseen God; and then the *method* is further described; the manifold invisible attributes become clearly seen, being conceived in the mind by means of the various works.

The invisible lying behind the visible as its cause, the unchangeable upholding all the changes of the world, the wisdom whose thoughts are written in heaven, and earth, and sea, the power which makes those thoughts realities,—these and the other Divine attributes are conceived in the mind (νοούμενα), and so discerned by means of the things that are made. The spontaneous act of reason by which the mind grasps in creation the idea of a Divine Author, St. Paul assumes and asserts as an admitted and unquestionable fact; this fact is indeed the true intellectual basis, as conscience is the moral basis, of all natural religion. On the process by which the mind ascends from the sensible impressions of things that are seen to the idea of the invisible God, "and so as it were resounds and re-echoes back the Great Creator's name," see Cudworth, 'Immutable Morality,' p. 177; and a fine passage quoted from Leibnitz, 'Essais de Théodicée,' Part I., by Saisset, 'Essai de Philosophie religieuse,' Part I. § 5.

*his eternal power.*] Among "*the invisible things*" of God "*power*" alone is specified, because it is the attribute first and most prominently displayed in Creation. It is clearly seen to be *eternal*, because by it all things temporal were created. The other attributes of God which are clearly seen in His works, such as wisdom and goodness, St. Paul sums up in one word, not *Godhead*, but **Divinity:** the word is not that which expresses the being or essence of God, *i.e.* Deity (Col. ii. 9), but a kindred and derived word, signifying the Divine quality or perfection of God as seen in His attributes.

*so that they are without excuse.*] **That they might be without excuse.** The words (εἰς τὸ εἶναι) express not a mere result, but a purpose. See i. 11; iv. 11, 16, 18; vi. 12; vii. 4, 5; viii. 29; xi. 11, &c. On 2 Cor. viii. 6 see note there.

Most modern Commentators have missed the true connection of this clause, and of the whole passage (*vv.* 19–21).

The sentence, "*For the invisible things of him .... are clearly seen ....*," is an explanation of the statement **God manifested it unto them;** and as the mode in which this manifestation *was made to them* is the mode in which it *is made* to all men, at all times, the explanation is put in the most general and abstract form (Present Tense and Passive Voice), without any limitation of times or persons; while the preceding and following statements (marked by the historic Aorists) refer definitely to those whom St. Paul is describing (αὐτοῖς, *v.* 19, αὐτούς, *v.* 20, αὐτῶν, *v.* 21), the **men that hold down the truth in unrighteousness.**

Thus the sense flows on without interruption, and the whole passage may be rendered as follows:—**For God manifested it unto them; for the invisible things of him, his eternal power and divinity, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made: That they might be without excuse,** *because that when they knew God they glorified him not as God.*

Chrysostom's objection, often repeated by others, that it could not be God's *purpose* in manifesting Himself to deprive men of excuse, although this was the *result*, is discussed in the note at the end of the chapter. Here it may be enough to say, God's *purpose* was

Digitized by Google

God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

22 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

23 And changed the glory of the uncorruptible [b]God into an image

[b] Ps. 106. 20.

to leave nothing undone on His part, the omission of which might give men an excuse for sin.

**21.** "That knowledge, or rudiment (scintilla) of knowledge, concerning God which may be obtained by contemplation of His creatures . . . . sufficeth to convince atheism, but not to inform religion. . . . No light of nature extendeth to declare the will and true worship of God." (Bacon, 'Advt. of Learning,' B. II.) This is true of God's particular will, and of special modes of worship desired by Him; but St. Paul here clearly teaches that men knew enough of God from His works to glorify Him in a way befitting His Divine Nature; but their fault lay in not loving what they knew:—"Minus amant quod summe est." "They love not perfectly the perfect Being." (Aug.) "The glory of God is the admirable excellency of that virtue divine which being made manifest causeth men and angels to extol His greatness, and in regard thereof to fear Him. By *being glorified*, it is not meant that He doth receive any augmentation of glory at our hands, but His name we glorify, when we testify our acknowledgment of His glory." (Hooker, 'E. P.,' Bk. II. ii. 1.)

St. Paul touches the root of sin in the words "*when they knew God, they* **did not glorify him as God, or give thanks.**" This passage seems to have inspired that loftiest strain of Christian adoration: "We glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory." The context however leads us to think of God not only in His nature, but in His works, as Creator and Ruler of the world and the source of all natural blessings to mankind. The passage will thus mean: "They **did not glorify him as God** (in his Divine perfections) or **give thanks** (to him as God the author and giver of all good." Compare St. Paul's discourses to heathen audiences in Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 24–29.

*but became vain.*] The direct opposition *in act* to glorifying God as God, is to exchange His glory for an image, v. 23: but St. Paul first shows the inner root of this opposition. The Hebrew word הֶבֶל "breath," "vapour," "vanity," is specially applied to an idol, as in Jer. ii. 5: "*they are gone far from me, and have walked after vanity* (LXX τῶν ματαίων, vain things, *i.e.* idols) *and are become vain*" (ἐματαιώθησαν). See notes on 2 Kings xvii. 15, and compare 1 Sam. xxvi. 21: "*I have played the fool* (μεματαίωμαι) *and have erred exceedingly.*"

*in their imaginations.*] The word διαλογισμός is commonly used of *evil* thoughts both in the LXX and New Test. It is variously rendered: "imagination" (Lam. iii. 60); "reasoning" (Luke ix. 46); and most frequently "thoughts" (Matt. xv. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 20). Here it means the false notions which men formed for themselves of God in opposition to the truth set before them in His works. "Wherein exactly did this *vanity* (of their thoughts) consist? In two things: (1) in the absence of a foundation in truth; and (2) in the positive absurdity of the idle fancies embodied in the Heathen Mythology and worship." (Bishop Thirlwall.)

*and their foolish heart was darkened.*] The heart is in Scriptural language the seat of intellectual and moral as well as of animal life, and out of it *proceed evil thoughts* (Matt. xv. 19, &c.). Thus their heart was already proved to be "foolish" or "void of understanding" when they failed to discern, or discerning did not love, the truth which God had set before them. They turned from the light *and their foolish heart was darkened:* this was a worse state than the former (Ephes. iv. 18). The abuse of reason impaired the faculty itself, and by following their vain thoughts they were led into a lower depth of spiritual darkness.

**22.** Self-conceit and folly go hand in hand: "**while** *professing themselves to be wise, they became fools*" (1 Cor. i. 19–24). Most modern interpreters agree with Calvin that the Apostle does not refer to the special profession of wisdom among Greek philosophers; for they were not the authors of idolatry, nor was it peculiar to them to think themselves wise in the knowledge of God. He is describing the conceit of wisdom which is necessarily connected with a departure from Divine truth, and out of which therefore idolatry in its manifold and fantastic forms must have sprung. "For heathenism," adds Meyer, "is not the primeval religion out of which men gradually advanced to the knowledge of the true God; but it is the consequence of falling away from the primitive revelation of God in His works."

The same original belief in one God may be traced in Egyptian, Indian, and Greek mythology, and this accordance of early traditions agrees with the Indian notion that

Digitized by Google

made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

24 Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:

---

"truth was originally deposited with men, but gradually slumbered and was forgotten" (Rawlinson, 'Herodotus' Book II., Appendix, ch. iii. p. 297). On the primitive records of a pure Monotheism in Egypt, see note 36 on p. 450 of Vol. I. of this Commentary.

**23.** *And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man.*] In their folly and as the outward expression of it men exchanged the worship of God for that of idols. The contrast between *the incorruptible* and the *corruptible* serves to aggravate the folly.

*into an image made like to corruptible man.*] Read, **for** *an image* **of the form of** *corruptible man.* The language, partly borrowed from Ps. cvi. 20, means not that they changed God's glory *into* an image, for this is not possible either in thought or act; but that they exchanged one object of worship **for** another. On the grammatical construction see note at end of chapter.

That St. Paul is here describing the origin of actual outward idolatry is clear from the whole context, and especially from the allusions to Ps. cvi. 20 (which describes the worship of the golden calf), and to the Egyptian worship of "birds and four-footed beasts, and creeping things," the ibis, the bull, the serpent and the crocodile. The statues of the gods of Greece by which St. Paul was surrounded at Corinth may have been in his mind as he wrote, but idols in human form were common in all heathen countries, and the Apostle is here giving a view of the origin and growth of idolatry in general, not a description of any particular form of it existing in his time. His language is partly taken from the Book of Wisdom (see xi.–xiii. and particularly xi. 15, xiii. 13) which itself echoes the thoughts of Isaiah (xliv. 13). Compare Deut. iv. 15–18 and Ps. cxv. 4–7.

### 24–32. The Divine Retribution.

This is shown first in the abandonment of the Heathen to unnatural vices (24–27), and then in their complete and utter depravity (28–32).

**24.** *Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts.*] Read, *Wherefore God gave them up* **in** *the lusts of* **their hearts to uncleanness.** What is the nature of this Divine agency?

1. *Permissive.* Chrysostom (εἴασεν), Theodoret (συνεχώρησεν), and others reduce St. Paul's statement to this, that God simply *permitted* the heathen to fall into uncleanness. But the force of the Greek words cannot be thus softened down: see 2 Chron. xxxii. 11; Matt. x. 21, xxiv. 9; 1 Cor. v. 5.

2. *Privative.* "How did God give them over? Not by compelling, but by forsaking them" (Aug., Serm. 50). All history shows that God did not deal with other nations as He did with His chosen people, raising up prophets and sending warnings and chastisements directly and visibly from Himself to restrain or recall them from idolatry and impurity.

When the heathen turned away from Him, shutting Him out from their thoughts and hearts, and giving His honour to senseless idols, He "gave them over **in** (not *through* as A.V.) **the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness.**" God did not cause their impurity, but He abandoned them to the natural consequences of the lusts already working in them. (Aug. on Ps. 35.)

3. *Judicial.* The preceding interpretation is right as far as it goes, but inadequate unless accompanied by a right view of what are called "natural consequences." We learn from experience that one sin leads to another, and that lust indulged gains greater mastery.

> "This is the very curse of evil deed,
> That of new evil it becomes the seed."
> SCHILLER (*quoted by Schaff*).

What the Apostle further teaches us is that this law of our moral nature is a law of the living God, who Himself works in and by it: and this is not a thought peculiar to St. Paul or his age, but a truth frequently taught in Scripture and acknowledged by every religious mind (Ps. lxxxi. 12; Acts vii. 42).

It is none the less true that every downward step is the sinner's own wilful act, for which he knows himself to be responsible. These two truths are recognized by the mind as irreconcilable in theory, but co-existent in fact; and the true interpretation of St. Paul's doctrines must be sought, not by paring down any, but by omitting none.

*to dishonour their own bodies between themselves.*] Or, **that their bodies should be dishonoured among them.** See note at end. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 15–18. It is not necessary to go beyond the Bible for instances of the close connexion between idolatry and impurity (see Num. xxv. 2; Wisd. xiv. 12, 23–27). As the heathen dis-



Digitized by Google

25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

27 And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.

28 And even as they did not like [1]to retain God in *their* knowledge, God gave them over to [2]a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;

29 Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, co-

[1] Or, *to acknowledge.*
[2] Or, *a mind void of judgment.*

---

honoured God by their idols, so He gave them up to dishonour their bodies by impurity.

**25.** To make more distinct this correspondence between the sin that was punished and the sin that was its penalty, St. Paul again points to the cause for which God gave them up,—a cause lying in their own character as "**men who exchanged the truth of God for the lie.**" (See note on *v.* 23.) "*The truth of God*" is His true nature as manifested in His works, the glory of the Creator (*v.* 23). "**The lie**" is the false substitute to which the idolater gives the honour that is due to God only (Is. xliv. 20; Jer. xiii. 25, xvi. 19).

*more than the Creator.*] Marg. "**rather** *than the Creator.*" The context shows that they did not worship the Creator at all, but passing by Him worshipped the creature in preference to Him.

*who is blessed for ever. Amen.*] A natural outburst of piety in the familiar language of the Old Testament (Ps. lxxxix. 52). However the Heathen may dishonour God, His glory is not thereby really impaired: He still "inhabits the praises of his people" (Ps. xxii. 3), He is still "blessed for ever" (2 Cor. xi. 31).

**26, 27.** *For this cause.*] A second time the Apostle points to the apostasy of the Heathen (*v.* 25) as the cause why "*God gave them up unto vile affections,*" or "shameful passions." The sin against God's nature entails as its penalty, sin against man's own nature. "*Their error*" was that of apostasy in exchanging the truth of God for the lie (*v.* 25): "*the recompense which was meet,*" *i.e.*, which according to God's appointment they must receive, was their abandonment to these unnatural lusts. Those who know what Greek and Roman poets have written on the vices of their countrymen can best appreciate the grave and modest simplicity of the Apostle's language.

**28–31.** The unnatural lusts already described were the most striking proof that the Heathen world was lying under the wrath of God. But such shameful sins, however common, were by no means universal, nor were they the only sins in which a Divine retribution was to be traced. St. Paul therefore adds a comprehensive summary of other sins to which the Heathen were given over.

**28.** *And even as they did not like.*] For the third time the Apostle insists on the correspondence between the impiety which rejected God, and the penal consequences of that rejection. This correspondence is heightened in the original by a play on words which can hardly be reproduced in English: "Even as they reprobated (lit. did not approve) keeping God in knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind." By "*a reprobate mind*" is meant a mind that is condemned and rejected as worthless (1 Cor. ix. 27; Tit. i. 16). The words "they did not approve" imply that their rejection of God was not unconscious, but deliberate and disdainful. Instead of improving their first knowledge of God (γνόντες, *v.* 21) into fuller knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) by attention and reflection, they put it from them, and so became "*the Heathen that knew not God*" (1 Thess. iv. 5).

"*Mind*" here means the whole reasoning faculty, intellectual and moral, all that conspires in doing a good action, or, as here, in doing "**the things which are not befitting**" (xii. 2; Eph. iv. 17).

**29–31.** The moral condition of the Heathen whom God has given over to a reprobate mind. In this catalogue of sins there is no strict system of arrangement, but traces of a sort of natural order may be seen in the grouping of kindred ideas, and even of words which sound somewhat alike in Greek. The force of the passage is much increased by the absence of all connecting particles.

**29.** In the first group we must omit the word "*fornication*" with the best MSS. (א ABCK, &c.), and read "*Filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness.*" "*Unrighteousness*" comes first as the

Digitized by Google

vetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,

30 Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,

31 Without understanding, covenant-breakers, [1]without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:

32 Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but [1]have pleasure in them that do them.

[1] Or, unsociable.

[1] Or, consent with them.

---

most general term, and one already used to describe the state against which God's wrath is revealed (*v.* 18).

By "*wickedness*" (πονηρία) is meant the active mischievousness which is connected with the inward disposition expressed by "*maliciousness*" (κακία) (Trench, Syn. of N.T. 2nd Ser.). The two words are connected in 1 Cor. v. 8, *the old leaven of malice and wickedness.*

*envy, murder.*] The natural sequence of these ideas is made more emphatic in Greek by the alliteration φθόνου, φόνου. Compare Eurip. 'Troades,' 763, and Lightfoot, Gal. v. 21. For "*debate,*" read "**strife.**" "*Malignity*" (κακοηθεία) is a disposition to take all things in the worst sense, a characteristic of the aged and the calumnious (Arist. Rhet. II. xiii. 3; III. xv. 10).

**30.** "*Backbiters*" or "**slanderers**" is a more general term than "*whisperers,*" including all who talk against their neighbours, whether openly or secretly.

*haters of God.*] The word elsewhere has always a passive sense, "hated of God" (Vulg. Syr.), and is explained by Meyer in that sense as being "a summary judgment of moral indignation respecting all the preceding particulars, so that looking back on these it forms a resting-point in the disgraceful catalogue." But in the earliest notice of this passage (Clement. 'Ep. ad Cor.' c. 35), an active sense is ascribed to the word (Θεοστυγία, "hatred of God"); it has the same sense "*haters of God*" in the Pseudo-Clement, Hom. I. c. 12, and is so understood here by Theodoret, Œcumenius, and Suidas. This active sense is undoubtedly better suited to a catalogue of sins, and the position of the word is most striking at the head of a descending series of the forms of arrogance, first towards God and then towards men. The ascending order is found in 2 Tim. iii. 2 "*boasters, proud, blasphemers.*"

*despiteful, proud, boasters.*] The worse forms of the sin come first.

The "*despiteful,*" or "**insolent**" are injurious in act (1 Tim. i. 13): the "*proud*" overweening in their thoughts towards others; "*boasters*" vain-glorious about themselves (see Trench). "*Inventors of evil things*" are strikingly described in Ps. xxxvi. 4, and Prov. vi. 12–15.

In 2 Macc. xii. 31, Antiochus is called "*the author of all mischief*" (πάσης κακίας εὑρετής), and Philo describes the advisers of Flaccus (c. iv.) as "sowers of sedition, busybodies, devisers of evil" (εὑρεταὶ κακῶν).

*disobedient to parents.*] The want of dutiful affection in the family stands first among a series of sins indicating (by the very form of the Greek words) the want of every principle on which social morality is based (Meyer). The same sin has the same bad pre-eminence in a similar series in 2 Tim. iii. 2. "*Disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers.*"

**31.** The word here rendered "*implacable,*" and in 2 Tim. iii. 3 "*truce-breakers*" has probably been brought in from that passage. Omitting it we may translate the verse thus: *Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection,* **without mercy;** "*Covenant breakers*" (ἀσυνθέτους) is the same word which is thrice applied to "*treacherous Judah*" in Jer. iii. 7, 8, 10.

**32.** The "reprobate mind" reaches the last stage of wickedness in men that are conscious of the deadly guilt of such sins as have been described, and yet not only do them, but also take pleasure in their being done by others.

On the various readings in this verse see Note at end.

*Who knowing.*] **Men that well knowing,** *i.e.* men of such a character that though they well know, &c.

"*the judgment of God*" (δικαίωμα) is that just sentence which He ordains as the Lawgiver and enforces as the Judge of all mankind: see ii. 16. St. Paul here speaks of it as a judgment fully known even to the reprobate, and therefore as one that has been stamped indelibly upon man's conscience.

*commit.*] Read **practise**: see on ii. 2, 3.

*worthy of death.*] See Luke xxiii. 15; Acts xxiii. 29; xxv. 11, 25; xxvi. 31, in all which passages "death" means simply capital punishment. But it is evident that the Apostle here speaks of death (1) as a punishment of sin and therefore not merely as the natural end of this life; (2) as a punishment ordained



Digitized by Google

by God, and therefore not simply the last penalty of human law; (3) as a Divine punishment recognized by the Heathen, therefore not only as revealed in the Mosaic Law or the Scriptural account of the first entrance of death.

*not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them*] *not only do* **them, but also** *have pleasure in them that* **practise** *them.* "*Not only . . . but also:*" the climax thus expressly indicated is in fact double: (1) To "**practise**" is more than to "*do*," implying more of deliberation and habit; (2) A man may "*do*" evil under the incentive of passion, for the sake of the attendant gratification or gain: he can approve evil in others only *as evil*, for its own sake.

The word rendered "*have pleasure in*" (συνευδοκεῖν) does not describe a passive assent or acquiescence in evil, but active consent and approval: see Luke xi. 48; Acts viii. 1; xxii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13.

The force of St. Paul's language is impaired in the Authorized Version by its different and faulty renderings of the word πράσσειν, "commit" and "do." See note on vii. 15.

It is an aggravation of guilt to "*know the judgment of God that they which* **practise** *such things are worthy of death,*" and yet to "*have pleasure in them that* **practise** *them.*" It is thus evident that St. Paul's climax, far from being artificial, feeble, or inappropriate (as some consider it) is clear and forcible in expression, just in thought, and most appropriate in its place at the close of the dark catalogue of sins.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. I., *vv.* 1, 4, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 32.

1. **Christ Jesus.** This order, found in B. am. fuld. Arm. and a few Fathers, is preferred by modern critics as less usual, and therefore more likely to have been altered. It is also characteristic of St. Paul, to whom the Lord was first made known, not as the man Jesus, but as the risen and glorified Christ. The same order is found in the salutation in 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., 1 Tim., 2 Tim. (Tisch. 8).

4. "*The Spirit of holiness.*"] This title has been interpreted as meaning (1) The Holy Ghost, the 3rd Person of the Trinity; (2) The essential Deity of the Son; (3) the Spirit of the Incarnate Son.

(1) Chrysostom and Theodoret explain that Jesus was proved to be the Son of God in accordance with the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles after His resurrection.

Others find the proof of His Divine Sonship in the miracles which He wrought according to the power of the Holy Ghost dwelling in Him, or in the predictions of the Prophets who spake of Him as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, or in the Resurrection itself supposed to be effected by the special operation of the Holy Ghost (see note on viii. 11).

Against all these interpretations there are two decisive objections, that they disregard the peculiar title πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, and that by giving a different sense to the Preposition (κατά) they destroy the parallelism of the two phrases—"*according to the flesh,*" "*according to the Spirit.*"

(2) The "Spirit of holiness" is supposed to mean the essential Deity of the Son, that pre-existent Divine Nature to which the Human Nature was added in the Incarnation.

(3) The "Spirit of holiness" is the Spirit of the Incarnate Son, the God Man, and therefore at once human and Divine.

Either of these two latter interpretations is consistent with the *language* of St. Paul, and in choosing between them, it is well to recall the wise caution of Dean Jackson, 'Creed,' Bk. vii. Chap. 30. "The manner of the union between the Son of God and the seed of Abraham is a mystery (that one of the blessed Trinity alone excepted) most to be admired by all, and least possible to be exactly expressed by any living man of all the mysteries whose belief we profess in this Apostles' Creed."

If we adopt the former of these two interpretations, we must admit that St. Paul does not here give a *complete* account of Christ's twofold nature. For otherwise we must either deny that Christ had any human spirit, which is the Apollinarian heresy, or say that His spirit was included in the "*flesh*" derived from the seed of David.

The difficulty is discussed by Origen in his comment on the passage, by Augustine, 'Enchiridion,' c. 38, and very fully by Aquinas, 'Summa Theologica,' Pars III. Qu. 32, where the statements of Ambrose and Jerome are quoted.

The Catholic doctrine can hardly be more exactly stated than by Jackson, 'Creed,' Bk. vii. ch. 30: "Neither the substance which the Son of God took from the blessed Virgin, nor the reasonable soul which was united unto it, nad any proper existence before their union with the Divine nature." "Christ's reasonable soul was not in order either of time or

Digitized by Google

nature first created, then assumed, but it was created while it was assumed, and assumed while it was created."

This statement of Dean Jackson's seems fully to justify the third interpretation, namely that Christ's human spirit is included, not in the "*flesh*," but in the "*Spirit of holiness*," as being the Spirit of Christ.

The same distinction of "flesh" and "Spirit" in the Incarnate Son is found in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "*Who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit*," where Bp. Ellicott rightly maintains that "the Spirit" is not itself the Deity, but the "higher principle of spiritual life," in which Christ "was shewn to be the All-holy and the All-righteous, yea, manifested with power to be the Son of God."

The student who may wish to pursue the subject should observe that in the passages which describe the Incarnation (Matt. i. 18, 20; Luke i. 35), and also in the early Greek Fathers and Creeds, πνεῦμα ἅγιον stands without the Article. This distinction was of course lost in Latin, and this makes it the more remarkable that the Latin Fathers so generally interpret "Holy Spirit" in those passages of the Son; see Tertullian, 'c. Praxeam,' § 26, 'de Carne Christi,' § 18, 'c. Marcionem' iv. §, 18, Hilary, 'de Trinitate,' X. "Assumptâ Sibi per Se ex Virgine carne, Ipse Sibi et ex Se animam Concepti per Se corporis co-aptavit." Compare the Preface to the works of S. Hilary, § 57; Bishop Bull, 'Defensio Fidei Nicænæ,' pp. 52, 53, 139, 203 (Oxon. 1846); Dorner, 'Person of Christ,' I. ii. pp. 367 ff, 'Protestant Theology,' II. 457; Pfleiderer, 'Paulinism,' I. 125.

**8.** For ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμ. Lachm. Tisch. Treg. read περί with preponderance of authority. A comparison of Ephes. i. 16 (ὑπέρ) with 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; ii. 13 shows that ὑπέρ might have been used in the same sense as περί.

**12.** There is a little irregularity in the grammatical construction.

Meyer, in order to find a subject for συμπαρακληθῆναι makes it parallel to ἰδεῖν: "For I long to see you, &c.; that is, to be comforted among you."

The objections to this construction are:

1. It passes over the nearer connection with εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς to the more distant ἰδεῖν.

2. It makes St. Paul's correction of his expression apply to ἰδεῖν κ.τ.λ., which does not as a whole need correction, instead of the part εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς which is the direct cause of the correction.

3. It supplies as a subject for συμπαρακληθῆναι only ἐμέ, which does not agree with the following phrase τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ.

For these reasons it is much simpler, and in fact necessary, to understand ἡμᾶς = ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐμέ as the subject.

If it be objected that where a new subject is introduced it ought to be distinctly expressed, it is sufficient to answer: 1st, that ἡμᾶς could not be here expressed in the sense required (ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐμέ), because the formal antithesis εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν ἡμᾶς συμπαρακληθῆναι would have limited ἡμᾶς to a sense excluding instead of including ὑμᾶς; and secondly, that St. Paul indicates the subject, which he could not express, by the σύν in συμπαρακληθῆναι—a compound found nowhere else in the New Test. or LXX.

**13.** καρπὸν σχῶ.] "Ἔχειν in its manifold collocations with τιμήν, δόξαν, &c., signifies '*assequi*,' and so here" (Tholuck).

This is a wrong explanation of the right meaning of σχῶ, "that I might get." The verb ἔχω means to have, hold, or possess: but the aorist has a momentary and, as it were, initiative force, which may often be expressed by "get": see John iv. 52; Matt. xxi. 38; Mark ii. 25; Acts xxv. 26; Phil. ii. 27; 1 Thess. i. 9.

**15.** οὕτως τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον. Various constructions have been proposed.

A. τὸ κ. ἐ. πρ. taken together as subject

(1) to a sentence οὕτως ἐστιν = "in accordance with this duty is the readiness on my part to preach."

(2) to a sentence ἐστιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι. "Accordingly the desire on my part is to preach."

B. τὸ κατ' ἐμέ taken apart from πρόθυμον.

(1) as an adverbial phrase: "thus there is—so far as in me lies—a readiness;" &c.

(2) as subject to πρόθυμόν ἐστιν. "So my part is ready; **so I for my part am ready.**"

The choice lies between A (2), which is harsh, and B (2), which is supported (though not fully) by Phil. i. 12, and is decidedly to be preferred as giving a proper grammatical construction.

**17.** *The just shall live by faith*] The accents in the Hebrew do not indicate the connection, "the just by his faith," but show that the stress of the sentence is on "faith," which is placed emphatically before the verb: "The just . . . by his faith shall he live." See Delitzsch on Hab. ii. 4 quoted by Pusey, who adds, "the expression *just by his faith* does not occur either in the Old or New Test. In fact, to speak of one really righteous (as צדיק always is) as being "righteous by his faith" would imply that men could be righteous in some other way." ('Commentary on the Minor Prophets.')

The δέ in ὁ δὲ δίκαιος, retained by St. Paul, shows that the antithesis is between "the

Digitized by Google

proud" and "the just," not between "the just by faith" and "the just" in any other way.

The LXX ἐκ πίστεώς μου (or as in some MSS ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως) ζήσεται seems to have arisen from mistaking ו for י. St. Paul omits the erroneous μοῦ without inserting αὐτοῦ, as unnecessary for his purpose. See on Gal. iii. 11, and on Heb. ii. 4.

**20.** ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου.] The phrase seems to occur nowhere else in LXX. or N. T.

When the Creation is employed as a mark of time, the phrases are:

(1) ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Matt., Luke, Hebr., Apocal. Cf. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Eph. i. 4).

(2) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου, Matt. xxiv. 21.

(3) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, Mar. x. 6; xiii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Apoc. iii. 14.

The Peshito Syriac gives the same rendering here as in Matt. xxv. 34, John xvii. 24, "from the foundation of the world." And in Ps. Salom. viii. 7, ἀπὸ κτίσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, is certainly a mark of time.

The Vulgate, on the other hand, for its usual renderings "a constitutione mundi," or "ab initio mundi," here gives "a creatura mundi," meaning "the created universe."

Theodoret, Œcumenius, Cyril, Photius, Luther, Calvin, &c., regard creation as the *source* of the knowledge.

**That they might be without excuse.]** The difficulty found in this hard saying since the days of Chrysostom, being due not to St. Paul but to his interpreters, must not induce us to deny the plain grammatical sense of the Apostle's words.

1. The rule that εἰς τό with an Infinitive expresses an end or *purpose*, not a mere *consequence*, seems to have no exception in the N. T.

The strongest *apparent* exception (2 Cor. viii. 6), has received its true interpretation from the fine insight of Meyer, following the clue given in the words διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ: "In the fact that the increase of charity wrought *by God's will* in the Macedonians, had encouraged him to bid Titus extend the collection to Corinth, St. Paul sees the fulfilment of the Divine purpose which he therein serves."

2. The speculative objection that "it can hardly be thought that "the conviction, confusion, and condemnation of men was any part of the Divine *plan* in Creation, although it follows as a *consequence* from it" (Bp. Wordsworth) is set aside by the distinction which Hooker has so clearly established between the "principal" will of God, and His "occasional" will. (See Appendix I. to 'Eccles. Polity' Bk. V. "*But above all things* we are to note what God willeth simply of his own voluntary inclination, and what by occasion of something precedent, without which there would be in God no such will."

The simple or "principal" will of God in giving a knowledge of Himself to His reasonable creatures is, that they may find their happiness in Him; it is only "by occasion" of their sinful neglect or abuse of this knowledge that God willeth "as it were with a kind of unwillingness," that they should be without excuse. In like manner Leibnitz, following the Schoolmen, distinguishes in God "two aspects of the will: one an *antecedent* will, which has for its object all that is good: and the other a *consequent* and decretory will, which acts for the best, and includes evil as a condition of good." (Saisset, 'Essai de Philos. relig.' p. 231.)

3. It is to be carefully observed that the purpose ascribed to God in making Himself known is not "the conviction, confusion, and condemnation of men"; it is not that they might be punished for sinning against knowledge, but that they might have no excuse for not knowing.

**23.** The construction ἀλλάττειν τι ἔν τινι is not found in classical Greek, but was adopted by the LXX in imitation of the Hebrew הֵמִיר "to exchange" followed by בְּ of the thing with which anything is exchanged: see Lev. xxvii. 10; Ps. cvi. 20; Sirac. vii. 18, Μὴ ἀλλάξῃς φίλον ἀδιαφόρου μηδὲ ἀδελφὸν γνήσιον ἐν χρυσίῳ Σουφείρ.

**24.** τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.] This is the reading of modern critical editors (Tisch. 8), and is to be rendered **that their bodies should be dishonoured among them.** The rendering "so that," &c. (Alford) is scarcely admissible.

The use of τοῦ with Inf. to express merely the *event* unmixed with the *design*, is very questionable. St. Paul commonly uses it to express the *purpose*, or at least the *tendency* of an act: Rom. vi. 6, vii. 3, xi. 8, 10; 1 Cor. x. 13; Gal. iii. 10. The reading ἐν ἑαυτοῖς is found in the majority of later uncials, in good cursives 17, 37, 47, in the Vulgate, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. It requires the Middle sense of ἀτιμάζεσθαι, against which the absence of other instances is not decisive.

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, retained by Meyer, expresses more clearly than would ἐν ἀλλήλοις the sin against their own, as well as against each other's body.

**32.** The Vatican MS. (Tischendorf, 1867) for ἐπίγνόντες, reads ἐπιγινώσκοντες, and for ποιοῦσιν, συνευδοκοῦσιν, the participles ποιοῦντες, συνευδοκοῦντες.

Clement of Rome (Cor. c. 35) after de-

Digitized by Google

nouncing some of the sins mentioned by St. Paul in *vv.* 29, 30, adds: ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες στυγητοὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν, οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες αὐτά, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες αὐτοῖς.

Hence it has been supposed that Clement found in Romans the reading,—οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ ποιοῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες τοῖς πράσσουσιν.

But it is far more probable that the transcriber of B, or some earlier MS., having the passage of Clement by his side, substituted the Participles in the text of Romans by mistake.

The sentence being thus incomplete, as in B., later Copyists tried to complete it by various additions: οὐκ ἐνόησαν D E, οὐκ ἔγνωσαν G.

For a full discussion see Reiche, 'Comment. Critic.'

---

## CHAPTER II.

1 *They that sin, though they condemn it in others, cannot excuse themselves,* 6 *and much less escape the judgment of God,* 9 *whether they be Jews or Gentiles.* 14 *The Gentiles cannot escape,* 17 *nor yet the Jews,* 25 *whom their circumcision shall not profit, if they keep not the law.*

THEREFORE thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things.

2 But we are sure that the judg-

---

### Chap. II.—The Jew brought into Judgment.

**1-29.** St. Paul pursues his proof of the universal need of such a saving power as is contained in the revelation of the righteousness of God by faith.

He has traced the downward course of mankind from the first wilful rejection of the knowledge of God through all the stages of idolatry and vice, showing the mutual reactions of moral depravity and mental darkness. Under general terms, and without once naming the Gentiles, he has painted the prominent features of the heathen world in bold and vigorous strokes. As the picture draws towards an end the shadows deepen, until at last in *v.* 32 we see that final stage of corruption in which men, having lost all natural virtue themselves and even the hatred of vice in others, retain only the consciousness of their misery and guilt, knowing the just sentence of God on them which do such things.

But there were some among the heathen and many among the Jews to whom this description could not be applied in its strongest *external* features of blind idolatry and hideous vice. They had not lost all knowledge of the true nature of God; they did not practise, still less applaud, the grosser forms of vice; their moral sense was keen enough to condemn the sins of others: yet they too must be brought to feel themselves guilty before God. How does St. Paul effect this? He strikes at the conscience, and strikes suddenly and sharply: "thou that judgest doest the same things: therefore the moral sense which judges others, but does not restrain thyself from evil, increases thy condemnation: for God will judge thee according to thy deeds" (*vv.* 1, 2).

**1.** *Therefore thou art inexcusable.*] **Wherefore thou art without excuse** (see i. 20). With startling suddenness the Apostle states his conclusion first, merely hinting by the one word "**wherefore**" its dependence on the principle stated in i. 32, "*that they which commit such things are worthy of death:*" and then in the words "*O man, whosoever thou art that judgest,*" he singles out each reader as the very man addressed, and at the same time extends his argument to all, in order that he may eventually apply it to the Jew.

The success of such an appeal to conscience rests on the fact that every man recognizes in himself at least the germs of those sins which he condemns in others. St. Paul uses the argument with admirable skill and power: he has roused a just indignation by his description of flagrant sinners, and as the stern sentence of condemnation is bursting forth, he seizes and turns it back upon the judge himself. "The man that hath done this thing shall surely die." "Thou art the man."

The argument, set in its logical order, would stand thus: Thou judgest that they which do such things are worthy of death: Thou that judgest doest the same things: Therefore in judging thy neighbour thou condemnest thyself, and art without excuse. St. Paul inverts this order by using his conclusion first and proving it afterwards. The repeated description "*thou that judgest,*" though applicable to all men, is especially characteristic of the Jews, whose condemnation of "sinners of the Gentiles" (Gal. ii. 15) was unsparing.

Digitized by Google

ment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things.

3 And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

4 Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?

5 But after thy hardness and impenitent heart [c]treasurest up unto [c] Jam. 5. 3.

The words "*O man*," as in ix. 20, indirectly rebuke the presumption of a weak mortal in assuming the Divine prerogative of judgment. Compare Luke xii. 14.

The accusation brought in the words "thou doest the same things" is renewed against the Jew by name in *vv.* 17–27.

**2.** St. Paul now completes and confirms his argument by an express assertion of the principle, already assumed in it, that God's judgment against the *doers* of evil applies equally to all,—to those who judge even as to those who take pleasure in them that practise such things.

For the truth of this principle he appeals to the conscience of his readers (as in iii. 19): "*We know*," it is a certain and well-known truth "*that the judgment of God*" (unlike that inconsistent judgment of man, *v.* 1) is directed "*according to truth*," *i.e.*, without error and without partiality (see *v.* 11) against the *doers* of evil.

**3.** *And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?*] **But** *thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which* **practise** *such things, and doest* **them,** *&c.* In contrast to the sure truth of God's impartial judgment of evildoers, stand the errors by which men evade its application to themselves: and first, the delusive hope of personal exemption. "But thinkest thou this—that *thou* shalt escape being judged at all?" The folly of such a thought is made more prominent by the description of the person supposed to entertain it: "O man, that judgest them which practise such things, and doest them." Dost thou, who art thus inexcusable and self-condemned (*v.* 1), think that *thou* of all men shalt be exempt from judgment?

No answer is needed: as soon as the thought is clearly stated, its folly is transparent. Yet it is a common form of self-deception: men are almost unconsciously influenced by a vague and undefined hope of impunity which they do not acknowledge even to themselves. The Jews, however, openly claimed exemption from God's judgment as the common privilege of the children of Abraham. "All Israelites will have part in the world to come:" "Abraham sits beside the gates of hell, and does not permit any wicked Israelite to go down to hell." (See the citations in Bull's 'Harm. Apost.,' cxvii. § 6, and in McCaul, 'Old Paths,' p. 450.) "They who are the seed of Abraham according to the flesh shall in any case, even if they be sinners and unbelieving and disobedient towards God, share in the eternal kingdom." (Just. Mart. 'Dial. c. Tryph.,' c. 140.) It is the same notion that is rebuked by John the Baptist, "*Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father*" (Matt. iii. 8, 9.) Thus without naming the Jew St. Paul already indicates him by one of his most characteristic errors.

**4.** *Or despisest thou, &c.*] The Apostle now puts an alternative question, suggesting another explanation of the disregard which men show in practice to the acknowledged truth of a future judgment. The effect of God's patience upon a heart hardened in sin is only to produce a contemptuous feeling of security: "*Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil.*" (Eccles. viii. 11; Ps. x. 11, 13; Sirach v. 5, 6.) God's "*goodness*" is a gracious benignity that would gladly bless and not punish: His "*forbearance*" suspends the stroke, when sin cries for vengeance: His "*long-suffering*" endures repeated provocations and is still slow to anger. "*The riches of God's goodness*" he only can despise, who is ignorant of the purpose for which it is manifested: it is a moral blindness only that can mistake God's patience for a weakness or indifference from which final impunity may be expected (c. ix. 22). The Divine "*goodness*" is here presented in a twofold manner: There is not only a gracious disposition (χρηστότης) in God, that makes Him *willing* to lead sinners to repentance: the same gracious quality embodied in God's dealings (τὸ χρηστόν) has a *real action* in leading to repentance even those who nevertheless do not repent: God's leading is as real as man's resistance to being led.

**5.** The false views implied in the two preceding questions are now refuted by *a direct assertion* of the true nature and consequences of the impenitent sinner's conduct: the delu-

Digitized by Google

thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God;

6 [d] Who will render to every man according to his deeds:

7 To them who by patient con-

d Ps. 62. 12. Matt. 16. 27. Rev 22. 12.

---

sive hope of personal exemption (*v.* 3) is especially dealt with in *vv.* 9 f.; and the second error of despising God's goodness is thus at once exposed in a direct and vivid contrast. God's goodness leads to repentance; but an impenitent heart will not be led, and as an effect of this obduracy the store of wrath is increased by the *riches* of goodness rejected. The Apostle says not "God treasureth up wrath," but "**thou** *treasurest up wrath unto thyself.*" "He adds to His long-suffering, thou to thine iniquity. . . . And what thou layest up a little every day, thou wilt find a mass hereafter." (Augustine, Enarr. in Ps. 93.)

*wrath against the day of wrath.*] Read "*wrath* **in** *the day of wrath.*" The expression sets forth with terrible emphasis the hardened sinner's doom. But while to him the Judgment Day is above all a day of wrath, it has also a more general character as a day which reveals to all, both good and evil, men and angels, that God is a righteous Judge (δικαιοκρίτης, 2 Macc. xii. 41); that not only in that last great act of judgment, but in all His dealings and dispensations, He judgeth righteously. This revelation of God's *character as a righteous Judge* (δικαιοκρισία, v. Pseudo-Just. Mart. Quæstt. Gent. 28), will consist in His rendering to every man according to his deeds.

**6.** This verse is an exact quotation from the Septuagint (Prov. xxiv. 12), and the same fundamental truth of a future universal judgment according to men's works, is constantly taught in the New Testament no less than in the Old (Matt. xvi. 27; xxv. 31–46; 2 Cor. v. 10). Against vain pretensions and imaginary privileges, St. Paul sets the acknowledged truth that God will judge and reward every man according to his actual life and true character.

The contrast here is not between works and faith, but between a man's deeds as realities and all that is unreal, between doing and knowing, between being and seeming, practising and professing. Thus we need not discuss modes of reconciling this passage with the doctrine that "*man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law*" (iii. 28). There can be no discrepancy, as the contrast between "faith" and "works of the law" has no place at this stage of the Apostle's argument. He is maintaining here that the rule of God's judgment will be real deeds of righteousness or unrighteousness. He will afterwards show that those "works of the law," which he contrasts with faith, are not real works of righteousness.

Again, we must not on the one hand so strain the sense of the passage, as to infer that each man's deeds earn by their own intrinsic merit that reward which God will render; nor on the other hand limit the sense, as if the Apostle had written "Who will render to every man according *to the evidence of* his deeds" (Calovius, Meyer). What St. Paul means by the accordance between each man's deeds and his reward, he himself explains in the following verses, and no narrower limitation of his meaning is admissible. The closer definitions attempted in the interests of controversy rest on distinctions which are not contained in the Apostle's words, and are quite out of place in this stage of his argument. See notes on iv. 4, and Augustine, as there cited, and compare Acts x. 34, 35: "*Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.*"

**7-10.** The accordance between "the deeds done in the body" and the future reward is now shewn in two great classes into which all mankind are divided, according to the moral aim of their lives.

**7.** Some interpreters (as Reiche, Ewald, and Hofmann) would arrange the verse thus: —"To the one, seeking eternal life, he will render according to their patience in well-doing, glory and honour and immortality." They argue that the words "according to patience in well-doing," must answer to the clause "according to his works" (*v.* 6), and so must express "*the rule by which God will judge.*"

But the older interpretation followed by our translators is to be preferred, because it both preserves the natural order of the original words, and gives at least as good, perhaps a better, sense; for St. Paul, instead of merely repeating the statement that judgment shall be according to works, brings out a new thought, that the rule of God's future judgment must also be the rule of man's present life, and so the reward must be sought "**in the way of** (κατά) *patience in well-doing.*"

The last words might be rendered more exactly "**perseverance in good work:**" not this or that good work is meant, but the life of the righteous is viewed as a whole in its unity of purpose, as one good work patiently pursued (c. xiii. 3; Gal. vi. 4; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rev.

Digitized by Google

tinuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life:

8 But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath,

9 Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the ‖Gentile;

‖ Gr. *Greek.*

10 But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the ‖Gentile:

‖ Gr. *Greek.*

11 For there is no respect of persons with God.

12 For as many as have sinned

---

xxii. 12). That this life of righteousness can be fully realized only in the Christian believer will be shewn at a later stage of the Apostle's argument (vi. 11-23). What he here sets forth is not the specific realization, but the general idea of the life which God will reward. Its form of outward manifestation will be "**perseverance in good work;**" its inner motive the longing after a higher state, in which man's perfected nature will shine forth in "*glory,*" his faithfulness will be crowned with "*honour,*" by God's approval, and his happiness secured for ever by the new gift of "*immortality.*"

These three elements, "*glory and honour and immortality,*" are combined in "*eternal life,*" and our Authorized Version has the advantage of representing the various elements of happiness which man has longed for, as being all united in the reward which God will bestow.

**8.** *But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth.*] "**But unto them that are factious and disobey the truth.**" The unrighteous are described as "the men of factiousness," an idiom which represents "factiousness" as the root of their moral character. (See notes on iii. 26; iv. 12, 14; Gal. iii. 10.)

On the word ἐριθεία see Note at end of chapter. The context helps to define its meaning here: it is a "factiousness" which consists in "disobeying the truth, but obeying unrighteousness." Allegiance is due to "the truth" (which answers to righteousness, 1 Cor. xiii. 6; Eph. iv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 10–12): to transfer this allegiance to the opposite power "unrighteousness" is factious.

*indignation and wrath.*] "**There shall be wrath and indignation.**" To complete the sentence we must not supply as in *v.* 7, "God shall render," but both here and in *vv.* 9, 10, "there shall be." The sudden change is significant: "Salvation is God's own work, punishment will be the effect of the sinner's obduracy" (Œcumenius).

In the right order "**wrath and indignation,**" the stronger word comes last, adding the idea of hot burning anger. St. Paul teaches us that the sense of God's wrath will be a chief element in that "*eternal destruction*" (2 Thess. i. 9), which we might have expected him to name here as the opposite to "*eternal life.*"

**9, 10.** St. Paul now repeats the thoughts of *vv.* 7, 8, with special emphasis upon the universality of the judgment as including Jews as well as Gentiles, and so refutes the Jewish error indicated in *v.* 3. The previous order of ideas is inverted, the thought of God's wrath against Sin being continued from *v.* 8; so that the words which describe the sinner's doom are heaped together with terrible effect.

That which coming from God appears under the form of "wrath and indignation," becomes when endured by the sinner, "*tribulation and anguish.*"

The former word denotes the pressure of a crushing burden, the latter the "straitness" of confinement, and the consequent helplessness, which forbid all hope of escape.

"*Every soul of man*" is not a mere circumlocution for "every man:" such explanations rob language of half its life and power. It is the soul that suffers (Matt. xxvi. 38, Acts ii. 43), under the wrath of God, even when the pain reaches it through the body. See xiii. i.

The two words "*worketh,*" *v.* 10, and "*doeth,*" *v.* 9, fail to represent the distinction between the simple verb in the Greek, and its compound (κατεργάζομαι): punishment is inflicted on him who "**worketh out evil**" to its full end (*v.* 9): while he "*that worketh good*" is rewarded for the effort itself without reference to the successful accomplishment of the work. See vii. 15.

*the Jew first.*] The Jew, who is here first expressly included in the judgment, has a priority in responsibility and punishment, as well as in privilege and reward: see on i. 16. But this priority will not interfere with the application of the same rule of judgment according to every man's works.

*Gentile.*] "**Greek:**" See on i. 16.

**11.** The reason why Jew and Gentile will be judged by the same rule lies in that freedom from partiality, which is part of God's character as the Righteous Judge (Deut. x.

Digitized by Google

without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;

13 (For not the hearers of the law *are* just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.

14 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the

---

17; 2 Chron. xix. 7; Job xxxiv. 19). "To accept the face" was to give a gracious reception to a suppliant or suitor (Gen. xix. 21; Job xiii. 10, xlii. 8), and the phrase being often applied to a corrupt and partial judge (Lev. xix. 15, &c.) has always in the N. T. the bad sense of partiality (Matt. xxii. 16).

**12.** The Jew might be led by his actual privileges to doubt whether the principle that "*there is no respect of persons with God,*" could be applied to him. The Apostle therefore proceeds to show how a strict impartiality will be maintained in God's future judgment of all men, whether Gentiles or Jews. A chief distinction between them was that the Jews had, and the Gentiles had not a revealed and written law of God; to such a law, therefore, St. Paul now applies the same argument from God's judgment by works, which he has already used in *vv.* 1, 2, concerning a moral sense which enables a man to condemn sin in others, but does not restrain him from doing the same himself.

*For as many as have sinned without law.*] The Apostle deals with the Gentiles first. As their sin, so shall their punishment be: to neither of these will the standard of a written law be applied, and yet apart from all consideration of such law, as surely as a man sins, so surely shall he perish under the judgment of God. The want of the greater light gives no impunity to abuse of the less: but punishment follows as a natural consequence of sin under God's general moral government. To "*perish*" in the future judgment is to lose what has been already described as "*salvation,*" "*glory and honour and immortality,*" "*eternal life.*"

*and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law.*] "*And as many as have sinned* **with law** *shall be judged* **by law.**" In stating the general principle of God's judgment, St. Paul uses the term "**law**" without the article for any written revelation of God's will; but, as in fact, there was no other such law given, but that of Moses, the sense is not materially affected by limiting the word "**law**" to "*the law*" of Moses, as in A.V. See Introduction, § 9.

The Jew, who could not dissent from the Apostle's statement of the condition of the Gentile, is equally involved in condemnation under a judgment, which is impartial and according to works. For he possesses a law, and hears it read in the Synagogue on the Sabbath day, and lives in professed obedience to it. Thus "law" constitutes the moral state in which he lives: if he sins, he sins "*in*" or under, or "**with law,**" and therefore "**by law**" he shall be judged.

**13.** The application of law as the rule of judgment, is an idea quite opposed to the fancied privilege and exemption of the Jews; St. Paul therefore confirms it by referring to the known principle of all law: "**for not they who are hearers of law**" (and nothing more than hearers) **shall be just before God, but the doers of law shall be justified.** This general principle is asserted by the Jewish law itself (Deut. xxvii. 26), and St. Paul here evidently assumes, as known to his readers, what he expresses elsewhere: "*For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them*" (x. 5).

The word "*justified*" is used here for the first time in the Epistle, and we cannot have a better opportunity of considering its meaning, which is clearly defined by the context.

(*a*) It cannot mean "*pardoned:*" for he that is justified as a doer of law, has nothing to be pardoned for; nor (*b*) can it mean "*made* just" for he is just already by the supposition. It means to be "acknowledged and declared just:" it is the exact contrary to being "condemned." There is no ground on which to condemn one who fulfils the law, he must therefore be justified. The word has evidently the same meaning in iii. 4, 20. In the present passage the meaning is confirmed by the parallel clause: "to be justified" is the same thing as "to be just before God," *i.e.*, according to his judgment (1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Thess. i. 6).

**14–16.** St. Paul has shown how the general principle that God "*will render to every man according to his works,*" applies to the Jews: they will be judged by law, and only law-doers be justified. He now shows that the same principle is applicable to the Gentiles also, though under another form. For although they have no "law," in the stricter sense of the word, that is to say, no revealed and written law like "the law" of Moses, yet substantially they have a law, or rather they "*are a law unto themselves.*"

Thus in *vv.* 14–16, St. Paul shows that the principle stated in *v.* 13 is in fact universal, and that the formal distinction between Gentile and Jew, *v.* 12, does not involve any

Digitized by Google

things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves:

15 Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, ¹their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts ‖the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)

16 In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

¹ Or, *the conscience witnessing with them.*

‖ Or, *between themselves.*

---

essential difference between them in reference to the Divine Judgment. The real existence of the inward law in the Gentiles admits a double proof, the one derived from outward acts (*v.* 14), the other from the working of conscience (*v.* 15).

**14.** *For when the Gentiles.*] The sense of the verse is made clear by translating it with due attention to the use of the Greek Article: "**For whenever Gentiles which have not a law, do by nature the things of the law, these not having a law are a law unto themselves.**" It is clear that here, as throughout the chapter, the Gentiles of whom St. Paul speaks are heathen; and by "*nature,*" as contrasted with the teaching of an outward law, he means the moral faculty, which is born with every man, however much or little it may be afterwards developed. But the Apostle does not speak of "*the* Gentiles" as a whole, nor of their rendering a complete obedience; occasional good deeds, such as "*the law*" approves, done by persons who have neither that nor any other outward law, are sufficient proof of an inward principle, by virtue of which such persons are "*a law unto themselves.*" It is remarkable that St. Paul here uses the exact words of Aristotle, who says concerning men of eminent virtue and wisdom: κατὰ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσι νόμος ('Polit.' III. xiii. 14). The first clause is quoted in Gal. v. 23 and the second here. Compare also Arist. 'Eth. Nicom.' iv. 8 (14) ὁ δὴ χαρίεις καὶ ἐλευθέριος οὕτως ἕξει, οἷον νόμος ὢν ἑαυτῷ, in reference to jesting.

**15.** *Which shew.*] "**Inasmuch as they show.**" Gentiles, such as have been described in *v.* 14, are proved to be *a law unto themselves*, because in their good deeds they shew that "*the work of the law,*" though not its word, the substance though not the form, is "*written in their hearts*" by the finger of Him who made them. Compare Sanderson, 'De Obligatione Conscientiæ,' iv. 25, and Cic. 'de Rep.' iii. 22: "Est quidem vera lex recta ratio naturæ congruens, diffusa in omnes, constans, sempiterna, quæ vocet ad officium jubendo, vetando a fraude deterreat."

*their conscience also.*] With the outward evidence of acts done in accordance with the law there agrees also (ξυμμαρτυρούσης) an inner witness, the moral sense, exercising itself upon men's own acts and upon those of their fellows. The Authorized Version is inaccurate in rendering μεταξύ here "*the meanwhile;*" translate thus:—"**their own conscience joining witness, and between one another their thoughts accusing or else excusing (them).**"

How does St. Paul's use of the word conscience correspond to the modern use? and what difference, it may be asked, is there between "*the work of the law written on the heart,*" and "*the conscience bearing witness?*" The former is the suggestive or prospective conscience that spontaneously forbids or commands prior to action; the latter is the subsequent or reflective conscience that passes judgment on deeds done, either by ourselves or others. Compare Fleming, 'Vocab. of Philosophy,' Art. 'Conscience.' "This faculty is called into exercise not merely in reference to our own conduct, but also in reference to the conduct of others. It is not only reflective but prospective, in its operations. It is *antecedent* as well as *subsequent* to action, in its exercise; and it is occupied *de faciendo*, as well as *de facto.*" See also Mansel, 'Prolegomena Logica,' Appendix, note F. Sanderson, 'De Conscientiâ,' I. § 27.

**16.** There is no need to put *vv.* 13–15 in a parenthesis, so as to connect *v.* 16 directly with *v.* 12. The words "*in the day,*" &c., refer to the whole subject discussed, from *v.* 12, or even from *v.* 6, to *v.* 15. The same words are appended in the same informal, but impressive, manner in 2 Thess. i. 10.

That *vv.* 14, 15. are not unconnected with *v.* 16, is seen in the thought that "*the secrets of men*" shall be judged; the Divine judgment shall penetrate to the inner sphere of conscience, and correspond to "*the work of the law written on the heart.*"

Why does St. Paul say, "*according to my Gospel?*" His arguments hitherto have been drawn from principles universally admitted; a judgment too of some kind was acknowledged both by Jews and Greeks; but that Jesus Christ would be the Judge, by neither. This is a distinctive doctrine of the Gospel (John v. 22; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 5); and as St. Paul has already, in his introduction (i. 1–5, 9. 15, 16), spoken of the preaching of that Gospel as the work to which he was set apart, he here very naturally calls it "*my Gospel,*" on the first occasion of bringing

Digitized by Google

17 Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God,

18 And knowest *his* will, and [1]approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law;

19 And art confident that thou

[1] Or, *triest the things that differ.*

---

forward in his argument one of its peculiar doctrines. For other interpretations see Note at the end of the chapter.

**17-27.** The minor premiss of the syllogism in verse 1, "*Thou that judgest doest the same things,*" is here proved against the Jew by name.

**17-24.** *Behold.*] Read "**But if.**" The dramatic "Behold!" is not unsuited to the "splendid and vehement eloquence" of this apostrophe; but the connection is made clearer by the right reading.

"**But**" implies that the conduct to be described is opposed to the principle just established, that not the hearers, but the doers of the law shall be justified. In *vv.* 17–20 a supposition is made ("**if,**") in which the boasted privileges of the Jew (17, 18), and his assumed superiority over others (19, 20), are for the moment admitted: and then a series of pungent questions, founded on these admissions ("Thou **then,**" *v.* 21), and put in startling contrast with them, brings out the flagrant inconsistency between profession and practice (21, 22).

If with the Authorized Version, and most editors, we make *v.* 23 also a question, we must suppose that this and the preceding questions are regarded as admitting no possible denial. But in the Greek a slight change of construction from the Participle to the Relative (*v.* 23), probably indicates the transition from the series of questions to the assertion which gives a comprehensive answer to them all, and closes the searching inquiry with a decisive condemnation (Meyer, Lange). The verdict, whether thus declared in *v.* 23 or assumed after it, is confirmed in *v.* 24, by its accordance with the language of the Old Testament, in such passages as Isaiah lii. 5, Ezekiel xxxvi. 20–23.

**17.** *art called a Jew.*] The name Jew, which first occurs in 2 Kings xvi. 6, was extended after the captivity to the whole people, and as distinguishing them from the heathen, was associated with national prerogative and Messianic hopes. The Jew, therefore, is represented as priding himself upon his national name (*vv.* 28, 29; ix. 4; Gal. ii. 15; Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9).

*restest in the law.*] "**Restest upon law.**" As the confidence of the Jew reposed on the mere fact of God's having given him *a* law, not on the particular character of the law so given, the more exact translation is "**restest upon law:**" the Greek article is omitted by the critical editors. Compare *v.* 25, and Introduction, § 9.

The real foundation of the prerogative of the Jews was the promise given to Abraham, the covenant of the law being subordinate and temporary. But the Jew had lost sight of this truth, and because God "shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and judgments unto Israel, and had not dealt so with any nation" (Ps. cxlvii. 19) the Jew rested supinely upon the possession of a law as an assurance of God's favour, instead of using it as a rule of life, and a light to the conscience. The same Greek word is used in the Septuagint (Mic. iii. 11), "Yet will they *lean upon* the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us."

The same spirit is indicated in the next clause.

*and makest thy boast of God.*] "**and boastest in God.**" An arrogant perversion of the glorying which God commends, "Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." This passage of Jeremiah (ix. 24) may have been in St. Paul's mind; for the last clause rendered in the LXX., "in these is my will," τὸ θέλημά μου, seems to be echoed in his next words.

**18.** *And knowest his will.*] Literally, "the will," which may mean either simply "*his will,*" as in A. V., or perhaps by way of excellence, "the one perfect will." See Barrow, Serm. iv. p. 34, and note on Acts v. 41. Dr. Lightfoot ('Revision of New Testament,' p. 106) shews that θέλημα, even without the Article, means the Divine Will in 1 Cor. xvi. 12, and in several Epistles of St. Ignatius.

*and approvest the things that are more excellent.*] Δοκιμάζω means (1) to "test," "prove," "discern" (c. xii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 13; xi. 28; 2 Cor. viii. 8, &c.); and (2) to "approve" as the result of testing (*c.* i. 28; xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 4; and especially Phil. i. 10, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα).

Many interpreters prefer the former meaning here, and understand by διαφέροντα "the things that differ," either morally, as good and evil, or that differ from "*the will*" of God. But these interpretations are very

Digitized by Google

thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness,

20 An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.

21 Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?

22 Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?

---

feeble when compared with that of the Vulgate and A. V. It would be a small thing to say of the Jew who prides himself on possessing the law and knowing the will of God, that he discerns the difference between good and evil. What St. Paul says is much more: "thou approvest (in theory) the more excellent things." The Jew thus says, as it were, of himself, "Video meliora—proboque," and feels that this refinement of his moral sentiment is an advantage which he derives from "being instructed out of the law," which was publicly read and explained to him on the Sabbath. See below on *v.* 20.

Though the language is just what the Jew would have used to describe himself, there is in the Apostle's use of it a latent irony which becomes more strongly marked in the following verses. Here the Jew's own privileges are enumerated; there the claims of superiority over others which he founded upon those privileges.

**19.** *And art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind.*] It was part of God's purpose in choosing Israel that they should become the witnesses and teachers of His truth: their sin lay in making a vain boast of the privilege, instead of fulfilling the duty. The language is such as was current among the Jews in regard to proselytes, and to the heathen generally; but St. Paul heaps phrase upon phrase, and "is lavish in what seem to be their praises," to strengthen the contrast, "exalting the one and abasing the other, that he may smite the more sharply, and make his accusation heavier." (Chrysostom.)

**20.** *which hast.*] Rather, **as having**. As in *v.* 18, so here again more emphatically, the law is brought forward as the ground of this presumptuous confidence: "*Thou art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind* . . . . **as having** the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law."

"*The form*" (μόρφωσις, "formation") here means the ideally perfect presentation of knowledge and truth, the outward conformation answering to their inner nature (Chrysostom, Grotius, Meyer, Ewald, Fritzsche, Philippi). It is not opposed to the substance as the unreal to the real, or the outward to the inward; for not even St. Paul himself, much less the Jew, whose thoughts he is here expressing, believed that in the law there was a mere empty form of knowledge. The Jew believed that he had in the law the sole embodiment of all knowledge and truth in their most perfect "*form*;" or (if we must express the Active sense of the original word), that he possessed in the law "the forming of knowledge and truth," that he could give to knowledge and truth their right form, and so was the proper teacher of the world. (Sirach xxiv. 8–12.) Compare Rabbi Artom, *Sermons* (1873) p. 110: "If the earth is to be *full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea*, it must be through our agency. We must infuse that knowledge: we possess the best materials for that instruction, and we must make it a duty and a glory to enlighten the world."

**21.** "At length the Apostle turns to strike." (Jowett.)

The arrogant claims and professions of the Jew, as just described, are strangely inconsistent with his actual conduct; and it is this inconsistency that forms the ground of the Apostle's questions.

The whole course of thought, and the two sins first specified—theft and adultery—seem to be suggested by Psalm l. 16: "*What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth? Seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behind thee. When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers.*"

We need not suppose, therefore, that these sins were *more* flagrant at this time among the Jews than at other times, or among other nations; but that they *were* flagrant is both historically certain, and implied in St. Paul's argument.

The teaching and preaching is not that of official persons only, but all the Jews are addressed as one person; a loud and ostentatious denouncement of sin was part of the national character.

*Thou therefore.*] "**Thou then.**" See on *vv.* 17–24.

*dost thou commit sacrilege?*] "**dost thou rob temples?**" The third offence charged is sacrilege, or temple-robbing. But does St. Paul mean to charge the Jews with robbing heathen temples, or their own temple?

Digitized by Google

23 Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?

24 For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is [a] written.

25 For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if

[a] Is. 52. 5. Ezek. 36. 20, 23.

---

Does he refer to breaches of the law laid down in Deut. vii. 25, 26, and repeated by Josephus ('Ant.' iv. c. 8, § 10), "Rob not foreign temples, nor take an offering inscribed with the name of any god?" Or, does he mean that the Jews robbed God of His offerings (Mal. i. 8, 12, 13, and iii. 8–10) and by their extortion and fraud made His temple "a den of thieves"? To these latter practices the original word is not elsewhere applied, perhaps is hardly applicable; and the mention of "the idols" in the opening clause, points decisively to the robbing of idol temples. Compare Acts xix. 57.

Sharp as the contrast is between theory and practice in the former questions, the sarcasm here reaches a climax of severity. Idols and all things belonging to them were by the law utterly accursed and abominable; yet covetousness could prevail even over the abhorrence of idols.

This interpretation is confirmed by *v.* 24, which shews that the sins specified are such as would fall under the notice of the heathen; and nothing would more surely make them blaspheme God's name than the robbery of their temples by those who made their boast of God.

**23.** *Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?*] **Thou that gloriest in law, by thy transgression of the law dishonourest God.**

The first clause is a summary of *vv.* 17–20, the last a decisive answer to "the four questions of reproachful astonishment" (Meyer), in *vv.* 21, 22. The contrast between privilege and practice that runs through the whole passage is thus used again, to increase the force of the final condemnation.

**24.** The statement that the Jew by his transgression of "*the law*," dishonours "**the God**" who gave it, is now confirmed and explained in language borrowed from Isaiah lii. 5, but applied in a new sense. The Prophet means that because God's people are suffered to fall under the oppression of their enemies, these last hold His name in contempt. St. Paul's meaning is that the vices and sins of the Jew make his religion and his God contemptible in the sight of the heathen. There is nothing in the Hebrew of Isaiah corresponding to the words "*among the Gentiles*:" but they occur repeatedly in a passage of Ezekiel (xxxvi. 21–23), which seems also to have been in the Apostle's mind, and they are naturally suggested by the last clause of *v.* 22. The addition thus made by St. Paul to the words of Isaiah, seems to have crept into the Septuagint Version of the original passage; a more remarkable instance of interpolation, due to the same cause, will be observed in the next chapter. See note on iii. 13 ff.

*through you.*] **Because of you.**

**25-29.** It has been shown that none but doers of the law shall be justified, and that the Jew, though making his boast in the law, is not a doer of it (12–24). But no mention has yet been made of his other great privilege, circumcision; if this is the seal of an unconditional blessing, he may yet escape. St. Paul, therefore, goes on to confirm and complete his preceding argument, by showing that the benefit of circumcision depends on the same condition as that of the law.

**25.** "*For circumcision,* **I admit, is of use if thou practise law;** *but if thou be a* **transgressor of law,** *thy circumcision* **has become** *uncircumcision.*" The Article is wanting, because "the stress is laid, not upon *the law* which God gave, but upon *law as given by God*" (Cremer). What St. Paul requires is the practice of moral obedience, "if thou be a law-doer." Compare note on *v.* 13; Lightfoot, 'Gal.' ii. 19, iv. 5, and Dr. Vaughan's good note on this passage.

St. Paul is not here stating the necessity for an exact fulfilment of the whole law, and the effect of an individual act of transgression; he supposes in the one case an habitual practical regard to law (πράσσειν νόμον), and in the other an habitual transgression of it. He is describing, not the condition on which a Jew could *earn* righteousness, but that on which he might hope for a promised blessing. The nature of this blessing is explained afterwards (iv. 11; ix. 4). The effect of habitual transgression is that the covenant is annulled; circumcision has thereby become uncircumcision, so far as any benefit from it is concerned. St. Paul's words of course bear this figurative meaning, but similar language is used in a literal sense by the Rabbis: "Let not heretics, apostates, and impious men, who are Israelites, say, 'Since we are circumcised, we go not down to hell.' What then does the Holy and Blessed God? He sends an angel, and turns their circumcision into uncircumcision, so that even they go down to

Digitized by Google

thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.

26 Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?

27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?

28 For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:

29 But he *is* a Jew, which is one

---

hell." (Schemoth Rabb. ap. Schöttgen.) Compare Lightfoot, 'Horæ Hebr.,' on 1 Cor. vii. 18.

**26.** The same principle rules the converse case of the Gentile: if obedience is so much more important than circumcision that the latter is useless without the former, may we not infer that the want of circumcision may be supplied by obedience?

The inference is expressed as a question to which no denial can be given.

*Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law.*] "**If then** *the uncircumcision keep the* **ordinances** *of the law.*"

Ordinances (δικαιώματα) mean here moral requirements. See note on i. 32.

The expression "*his uncircumcision*," clearly proves that St. Paul is not thinking of the "uncircumcision" as a whole, but only of this or that uncircumcised person. Nor is he speaking of "an impossible case" (Alford), *i. e.* of such an entire fulfilment of all "the righteous demands" of the law as no man can render; he is supposing, as in *v.* 14, the possible case that a heathen might render just such an obedience to the moral law as a pious Jew might and ought to render; and argues that the Gentile's uncircumcision would not make his obedience the less acceptable. If he do right, and so far as he does right, he shall share in the mercy covenanted to the pious Jew (Matt. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6). It is not circumcision, therefore, that the Gentile wants.

**27.** *And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?*]

Render: **And the natural uncircumcision fulfilling the law shall judge thee, that with Scripture and circumcision art a transgressor of law.**

In the A. V. this verse, as well as *v.* 26, is treated as a question; it has greater force as an answer, taking up and enlarging the subject-matter of the question. On this form of answer, see Jelf's 'Greek Grammar,' 880, i.

In the A. V., "*if it fulfil the law*" is a needless repetition of the hypothesis made in *v.* 26. The disobedience of the Jew and the obedience of the Gentile supposed in *vv.* 25, 26, are here both assumed.

"**The natural uncircumcision**" means the Gentile, this or that individual, who remains as he was by nature, uncircumcised. Such an one, fulfilling the law, shall by contrast judge the Jew that transgresses it.

The Jew, that was so ready to judge others (ὁ κρίνων, *v.* 1), is thus himself brought to judgment.

"**Scripture**" seems more suitable than "*letter*," which is too narrow. The contrast is not between "letter" and "spirit," as in *v.* 29, but between "a *written* law," and the unwritten law of nature (*v.* 14).

Accordingly, there is no disparagement of the written law; rather it is regarded, like circumcision (*v.* 28), as an advantageous circumstance to the Jew, but one under which, through his own fault, he comes to no better result than being a transgressor.

For a similar use of the Greek preposition διά to denote the attendant circumstances, see iv. 11; xiv. 20.

**28, 29.** The reason why circumcision avails so little in the case just discussed (25–27) is, that it is not the true circumcision of the heart, but only the sign, without the grace.

**28.** This verse is well rendered in A. V. In *v.* 29, the Subjects only are expressed in the Greek, and the Predicates must be mentally repeated from *v.* 28, thus: "**But he which is inwardly a Jew** (is truly a Jew), **and circumcision of heart in spirit not in letter** (is true circumcision)."

"**Circumcision of heart,**" as a figurative expression for inward purity, is as old as the Book of Deuteronomy. See x. 16; xxx. 6; and Jerem. ix. 26. In the N. T. the idea is found only in St. Stephen's memorable speech, and in St. Paul's Epistles.

The element in which this true circumcision takes place is "*spirit*;" that is, the inner life which man lives under the influence of the Divine Spirit.

In contrast to this, "*letter*" is the mere outward element of written law; and circumcision "**in spirit not in letter,**" is a circumcision which does not stop short at

Digitized by Google

inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God.

---

outward conformity to the law, but extends to the sphere of the inner life. Compare vii. 6, 2 Cor. iii. 6.

*whose praise is not of men, but of God.*] It is not at first sight apparent why St. Paul has added the clause, "*Whose praise is not* from *men, but* from *God.*" But we must remember that he began his address to the Jew in *v.* 17, by an allusion to the name on which he prided himself, "*thou art called a Jew,*" and that he has just described in this verse the Jew that is worthy to be so-called. What, then, can be more natural, or more like St. Paul's style, than a renewed reference to the meaning of the name Jew? When Leah bare her fourth son she said, "*Now will I praise the Lord: therefore she called his name Judah*" (Gen. xxix. 35).

When Jacob lay a-dying, this was the beginning of his blessing upon Judah: "*Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise*" (Gen. xlix. 8).

St. Paul, in like manner alluding to the meaning of the name, says of the true Jew that his *praise is not* from *men, but* from *God.*

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 8 and 16.

**8.** *τοῖς ἐξ ἐριθείας.*] See Fritzsche's elaborate excursus on this passage.

*ἔριθος*, a labourer, a hireling.

*ἐριθεύω*, to act as a hireling, *i.e.* in a mercenary self-seeking spirit (*ἐριθεῦσαι μέν τι τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ βουληθείς*, Schol. ad Soph. Aj. 833).

Hence *ἐριθεύομαι* (Arist. Polit. v. 3) and *ἐξεριθεύομαι* (Polyb. x. 22, 9) have the sense of canvassing or hiring partisans and forming factions in the State; and *ἐριθεία* (Arist. Polit. v. 2 and 3 p. 1302, and p. 1303) means a self-seeking ambitious rivalry, party spirit, or factiousness.

It is so explained by Suidas; and Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact interpret it as "contentiousness" or "factiousness," a meaning which is easily adapted to the context in the N. T. passages (Rom. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 17, ii. 3; Ja. iii. 14, 16).

**16.** *according to my gospel.*] The right interpretation is given by Origen, who, after remarking that the secrets of men can be judged only by God who searcheth the heart, proceeds thus: "Which judgment nevertheless according to the gospel of Paul, that is, the gospel which Paul preaches, will take place through Jesus Christ: '*for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.*'"

This interpretation is confirmed by the other two passages in which St. Paul uses the expression "*my gospel,*" in both of which he refers to distinctive and fundamental doctrines of the Gospel which he preached, namely in xvi. 25 to the extension of Christ's kingdom to the Gentiles, and in 2 Tim. ii. 8 to the resurrection and Davidic descent of Christ.

Calvin's comment, "He calls it his gospel in reference to his ministry," though not sufficient here, is quite applicable to 2 Thess. ii. 14, and 2 Cor. iv. 3.

Others less correctly regard *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου* as expressing the rule by which God will judge.

Thus Meyer: "Paul was so certain of the sole truth of the Gospel committed to him (xvi. 25; Eph. iv. 20 f.) which he had by revelation of God (Gal. i. 11 f.) that he could not but be equally certain that the future *judgment* would not be held otherwise than *according to his Gospel*, whose contents are conceived as the *standard of the sentence.*" But the standard has been already stated in *v.* 13; God will judge every man "*according to his works*": and the thought that the Gospel preached by St. Paul will be the standard by which God will judge Jews and Gentiles is very inappropriate at this stage of the argument.

Lange: "The day on which God judges the secrets of men according to the Gospel of Paul, is the day when the Apostle preaches the gospel to them." This explanation is excluded by the evident fact that the whole context points to the day of final judgment.

The notion that by "*my gospel*" St. Paul means the Gospel according to St. Luke is mentioned by Eusebius, 'H. E.' III. iv., in a way which implies that he gave no credit to it (*φασὶν δὲ ὡς ἄρα κ. τ. λ.*).

That he cannot mean to characterize his Gospel as different from that preached by the other Apostles, is evident from the fact that they also from the first had announced as a distinctive doctrine of the Gospel that Christ would come again to judge the world. (Acts iii. 19–21; x. 42: compare Matt. xxv. 31; John v. 22.)



Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER III.

1 *The Jews' prerogative:* 3 *which they have not lost:* 9 *howbeit the law convinceth them also of sin:* 20 *therefore no flesh is justified by the law,* 28 *but all, without difference, by faith only:* 31 *and yet the law is not abolished.*

WHAT advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit *is there* of circumcision?

2 Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.

3 For what if some did not be-

---

CHAP. III.—1–8. THE JEW'S OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

St. Paul has shown that the Jew's superior knowledge of God was useless, without practical obedience (ii. 17–24), and that circumcision without inward purity was no better than uncircumcision (ii. 25–29).

Yet the people whom God had chosen for Himself out of all nations, must have some real advantage over the heathen; and the covenant, of which circumcision was the sign, must confer some benefit, for God Himself was the author of it.

St. Paul expresses these thoughts in the opening questions of ch. iii., in a form which assumes the reality of Jewish privilege.

**1.** *What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?*] "**What then is the advantage of** *the Jew? Or what* **the benefit** *of circumcision?*"

The summary answer, "*Much every way,*" is not the boast of an imaginary Jewish opponent, whose argument (1–3) is cut short by St. Paul in *v.* 4: but it is the Apostle's own conviction, as is clear from the parallel passage, ix. 4, 5. While exposing with just severity the Jew's hollow pretences to personal merit or impunity, he yet recognizes with the spirit of a true Israelite the good gifts which God had bestowed upon His people. Compare Deut. xxxiii. 29.

**2.** *chiefly, because that unto them were committed, &c.*] "**For first** [it is much] **that they were entrusted with** *the oracles of God.*" St. Paul does not expressly say, as in A.V., that the possession of *the oracles of God* was the Jew's *chief* advantage, but implies as much by giving it the first place in his intended enumeration of the blessings of the covenant. Compare Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20: "*He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation.*"

The name "*oracles,*" is applied in the New Testament only to the revelations made to Moses (Acts vii. 38), and to the Divine utterances generally (Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11).

"I am not unaware," writes Philo, "that all the things which are written in the sacred books are oracles delivered by him (Moses): and I will set forth what more peculiarly concerns him, when I have mentioned this one point, namely, that of the sacred oracles some are represented as delivered in the person of God by His interpreter, the divine prophet, while others are put in the form of question and answer, and others are delivered by Moses in his own character as a divinely prompted lawgiver, possessed by divine inspiration." (Life of Moses, c. xxiii. Compare "On the Virtues and Office of Ambassadors," c. xxxi.) The corresponding term in the Old Testament (אִמְרֵי אֵל, τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ) is used of any Divine revelations (Num. xxiv. 4, 16), of the precepts of God's Law (Ps. cvii. 11; cxix. 148, 158), and especially of God's promises (Ps. cxix. 38, 49, where see notes).

That which gave to "*the oracles of God*" in the Old Testament their highest value was the promise of salvation in Christ, which ran through the Law and the Prophets: and that promise being made, not to one generation, but to "*Abraham and his seed for ever,*" not to one nation, but to "*all the nations of the earth,*" the oracles which contained it were a trust committed to the Jews for the common benefit of mankind.

And over and above their share in the general promise, the Jews had a great and special advantage in having this trust committed to them.

For the trust not only brought with it the various blessings which distinguished the Jews under the old covenant above all the nations of the earth, but was further accompanied by special and peculiar promises given to the Jews as a nation, that they should themselves be heirs of the promised salvation. And this natural prerogative has not been, and cannot be, lost, as St. Paul proceeds to show,—thus dropping the enumeration of other privileges.

**3.** *For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?*] **For what if some disbelieved? shall their want of faith make the faithfulness of God of none effect?** St. Paul is not speaking, as some have supposed, of disobedience to the Law, or unfaithfulness to the covenant, but of disbelief of the oracles and their fulfilment in Christ. The Greek word does not mean "disobedience," but "unbelief." Nor could it be supposed that the

Digitized by Google

lieve? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?

4 God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, [b]That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.

[b] Ps. 51. 4.

5 But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what

---

disobedience of former generations had forfeited the national privilege: for the promise had been renewed from age to age as long as prophecy continued. All former unbelief did but foreshadow and prepare the great national apostasy now well-nigh accomplished in the rejection of Christ by the Jews. This subject, here briefly touched to meet a possible objection, is the main theme of ch. ix.—xi. And we there see how anxious St. Paul was to assure himself and others that "*the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*," and that His faithfulness would surely accomplish His promises to Israel in the ages to come. Thus in the question, "**Shall their want of faith make the faithfulness of God of none effect?**" the future tense has its simple and proper meaning.

Even the present unbelief of the Jews was not universal: "*Some did not believe;*" "*some of the branches* **were** *broken off*" (xi. 17): "*blindness in part is happened to Israel*" (xi. 25).

This is not an inaccurate mode of speaking, nor an attempt to soften down an unwelcome truth; still less is it an expression of irony or contempt, as though unbelievers, however many, were of little account. For St. Paul is not distinguishing between "some" and "many," but between "some" and "all;" not thinking of the comparative number of Jewish believers and unbelievers in his own generation, but looking forward to the time when "*all Israel shall be saved*" (xi. 26).

It is to be remarked that "*some*" in the original signifies a part of the whole, but not necessarily a small part of it. It may be a very great part and majority of the whole,—as in Hebrews iii. 16, where it is said, "Some when they heard provoked, howbeit not all that came out of Egypt with Moses." All did provoke God on that occasion except Joshua and Caleb, and those who were still too young to bear arms . . (Chalmers.) The question being, What is the advantage of the Jew? the *some* must be some of *the Jews*. In every generation there were a few found faithful, and so in the generation to which the Gospel was preached. And though the great majority of that generation, and of all that have succeeded it, did not believe, still the nation is not finally rejected (xi. 1, 25, 26). Moreover, even in the case of those who did not believe, God's promise was proved faithful: they had the advantage, though they would not use it.

4. *God forbid: yea, let God be true.*] **Not so be it: but let God be true.** It is not enough to reject with righteous abhorrence (μὴ γένοιτο) the thought that the unbelief of some could make void God's faithfulness to others. God's truth is absolute and independent: it cannot be impaired, even if man's falsehood be universal.

Nay more, God's truth is the only truth: it will be found in the end that He alone is holy and righteous, and every man, in himself, unholy and unrighteous. So let it be: "*let God be true, but every man a liar.*"

The last clause, expressed in the exact words of Ps. cxvi. 11 (Septuagint), is an essential part of the argument, that truth must be ascribed to God, and none but God.

St. Paul adopts the apt words of the Psalmist to express his own thought, and this is why for "*unbelief*," and "*faithfulness*" (*v.* 3) he now substitutes the correlative ideas "truth" and "falsehood:" these again give place to "righteousness" and "sin" in the quotation which follows from the 51st Psalm.

It is clear, from the objection introduced in *v.* 5, that St. Paul quotes the words of David as a declaration that man's sin serves to establish God's righteousness.

And this is David's own meaning, when he says, "*Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned . . . that mightest thou be justified.*" (See note ix. 17. Hupfeld and Perowne on Ps. li. 4, and Winer 'Gk. Gr.' liii.) When David's conscience is awakened, he beholds his sin in its most heinous aspect as essentially opposed to the holiness of God: and in that opposition he sees that his own sin serves to establish the truth that God alone is righteous.

We have thus a fine climax in the Apostle's thoughts: "Shall the unbelief of some make void the faithfulness of God? Nay, let God alone be found true, and *all* men false: for the sin of man serves to show that "*holiness belongeth unto God.*" This is no digression: for it is over the self-righteousness of the Jew that St. Paul must win his way to the great truth that "all have sinned" (9, 19)

5. The truth stated in *vv.* 3, 4, might easily be perverted into a false claim of impunity. If the unrighteousness of us men establishes and commends God's righteousness, what conclusion shall be drawn?

The term "*righteousness of God*" here



Digitized by Google

shall we say? *Is* God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? (I speak as a man)

6 God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world?

7 For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?

8 And not *rather*, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that

---

denotes the Divine attribute in its comprehensive sense, as including God's faithfulness (*v.* 3) and truth (*v.* 4). The argument is capable of universal application, but is here aimed at the conscience of the Jew, from whom the Apostle would cut off all false pretexts of impunity.

*Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?*] **Is God that inflicteth his wrath unrighteous?** We know that God's wrath is revealed against unrighteousness (i. 18, ii. 8): "Is He as the inflicter of that wrath unrighteous? Is it unjust in Him to punish the sin that confirms the sole glory of His righteousness?"

*Is God unrighteous?*] The very form of the question, in the Greek, implies that the answer must be negative. And yet even in this form St. Paul cannot state such a thought as coming from his own mind: "*I speak*," he says, "*as a man*," *i.e.* "*according to* the foolish and unworthy thoughts of God, entertained by *man*."

**6.** When he begins to speak as a Christian teacher, according to his own higher standard, he can only reject such a thought as impious: "*God forbid! For*, (if God that inflicteth his wrath *is* therein unjust,) *how shall God judge the world?*"

The argument is very simple; it does not go beyond the limits of the thought in Gen. xviii. 25, "*Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?*"

The supposition of injustice in God's infliction of his wrath is directly contrary to the fundamental truth that God shall "judge the world in righteousness" (Heb. vi. 2; Acts xvii. 31).

That truth as one of the first elements of religion is so certain, that whatever contradicts it must of necessity be false. Thus by a rapid appeal to the first elements of religion, St. Paul is content to show that the supposition of injustice in the punishment of sin, because it establishes God's righteousness, must be false. *Where* the fallacy lay in the process of reasoning that could lead to such a false influence, he does not stop to show. The explanation commonly given is that God's righteousness is established not by sin *in itself*, but by sin as dealt with by God, punished by His holy vengeance, pardoned by His grace, or overruled to good effect by His wisdom.

A simpler view and more suited to the context is, that as the sinner does not wish or intend to establish God's righteousness, no merit for this result is due to his sin, which remains under an undiminished curse.

"We cannot say truly that *as* God to his own glory did ordain our happiness, and to accomplish our happiness appoint the gifts of His grace, *so* He did ordain to His glory our punishment, and for matter of punishment our sin. For punishment is to His will no desired end, but a consequent ensuing sin; and in regard of sin, His glory an event thereof, but no proper effect, which answereth fully that repining proposition,—'If man's sin be God's glory, why is God angry?'" (Hooker, 'E. P.,' Bk. V., App. No. I.; 2nd ed. Keble, vol. ii. p. 572) Compare also Archbishop King, 'Origin of Evil,' vol. ii. p. 440.

**7.** The argument of *v.* 6 is continued. If, because sin commends the righteousness of God, it is unjust for Him to punish the sinner, all judgment becomes impossible. For I, or any man, may on this ground protest against being judged, and plead thus at the last day:—If God's truth was more abundantly manifested by my lie, and His glory thereby increased, is not that enough? Why farther am *I* also, on my side, brought to judgment as a sinner?

The tenses shew that the scene is laid at the last Judgment; and the emphatic pronouns in "*my lie*," and "*I also*," set clearly before us the individual sinner on one side, and God on the other.

For the general term "sin," or "unrighteousness" (*v.* 5), "*lie*" is used in reference to the words "*every man a liar*," in *v.* 4. "*The truth of God*," as His attribute, is not capable of increase, but it may abound more unto His glory by being more fully manifested in the contrast with man's sin.

**8.** The false plea, just proved to be inconsistent with the certain truth of a future Judgment, is now shown to be destructive of all morality. The sinner, who speaks in *v.* 7, is about to continue his daring protest, Why am I judged? and why may I not do evil that good may come?

But the thought occurs to St. Paul, that the very charge slanderously brought against himself and those who followed his doctrine was, that they practised and taught this impious maxim.

Digitized by Google

good may come? whose damnation is just.

9 What then? are we better *than they?* No, in no wise: for we have before [1]proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin;

[1] Gr. *charged.*

10 As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:

11 There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.

12 They are all gone out of the

---

*And not rather, as we be slanderously reported,*] **And why not, as is slanderously reported of us.** The sentence beginning, "**And why not,**" is interrupted by the sudden thought, "**as is slanderously reported of us,** *and as some affirm that we say;*" and the interrupted conclusion is then attached to this intervening sentence, and necessarily expressed in the Plural, "*Let us do evil that good may come.*" The slander to which St. Paul thus alludes, was evidently directed against his doctrine that man is justified by faith, not by the works of the law (see vi. 1, and 15 ff.). But the refutation of the slander here is only incidental; the main purpose of the passage (*vv.* 5–8) is to cut off from the Jew all claim of exemption from God's judgment.

Accordingly the concluding sentence is directed, not against the slanderers just mentioned, but against those who object to being *judged* as sinners: "**whose judgment is just.**" The fine irony of this summary decision, and the connexion of the passage, are rather obscured by substituting, as in A. V., "*condemnation*" for "**judgment.**"

9–20. Confirmation from the Jewish Scriptures of the Charge that all are under Sin.

**9.** *What then? are we better than they?*] The privileges of the Jews (*vv.* 1–4) might lead them to infer, as we know they did infer (see on ii. 3), that they were better than others in God's sight, and in view of His judgment. This false presumption is now brought prominently forward in order to be completely refuted. See note at end.

*No, in no wise.*] Οὐ πάντως has two meanings. (1) "Not altogether" (1 Cor. v. 10).

(2) "Not at all." A clear example of this latter meaning is found in the Epistle to Diognetus, c. ix.:—οὐ πάντως ἐφηδόμενος τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἡμῶν (ὁ Θεός).

This sense, required by the context, is forcibly expressed in the A. V.

*for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles.*] "**For we before charged both Jews and Greeks.**" The charge against the Gentiles is made in c. i., and that against the Jews in c. ii. 17–24; but the latter are here put first in accordance with the Apostle's purpose, which is to show that Jews *as well as* Gentiles are all sinners before God (*v.* 19). Compare i. 16 and ii. 9, 10, for a like priority assigned to the Jews, and for the use of "**Greeks,**" as equivalent to "*Gentiles*" in general.

*that they are all under sin.*] The expression denotes subjection to sin as a power that practically rules the life of all men, in their natural state, unrenewed by God's grace. Compare vii. 14; Gal. iii. 22.

**10-20.** *As it is written.*] At this point, St. Paul turns to the testimony of Scripture, as being in accordance with the charge of universal sinfulness which he has already made on other grounds.

**10-12.** This first quotation is from Ps. xiv. 1–3, which is almost identical with Ps. liii. 1–3. St. Paul seems to quote from the LXX, with noteworthy variations.

*There is none righteous.*] Hebr. and LXX, "There is none that doeth good," as in *v.* 12 (Ps. xiv. 3). The word "*righteous*" gives the same sense in a form more exactly agreeing with the Apostle's general argument: "Δίκαιος aptum verbum in sermone de justitiâ." (Bengel.)

*no, not one.*] LXX, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός, which same words occur below in *v.* 12 (= Ps. xiv. 3). The Hebrew has corresponding words there, but none here; the addition was apparently made by St. Paul, and carried back at an early period into the LXX. See note on *v.* 12. The words thus added to the first sentence cited by the Apostle, serve to bring out in substantial agreement with the Psalmist, only more emphatically, the universal prevalence of sin, which admits no exception. This is more in accordance with St. Paul's manner of quotation, than to suppose that after the formula "*as it is written,*" and before the words of Scripture, he has interposed his own summary of all that follows.

**11.** *There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.*] Hebr. and LXX, Ps. xiv. 2: "*The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God.*" In abridging the passage, St. Paul rightly expresses the negative sense which is implied in the original.

In the right reading (ὁ ξυνιῶν), observe (1) the form ξυνιῶν, usual in the LXX, in

Digitized by Google

way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.

13 Their throat *is* an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps *is* under their lips:

14 Whose mouth *is* full of cursing and bitterness:

15 Their feet *are* swift to shed blood:

16 Destruction and misery *are* in their ways:

17 And the way of peace have they not known:

18 There is no fear of God before their eyes.

19 Now we know that what

---

the nominative singular only, for ξυνεὶς, which occurs in Ps. xxxiii. 15; (2) the Article, "non est qui intelligat;" (3) the idea of sin as folly, in accordance with the opening thought of the Psalm, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God."

**12.** *They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable.*] This agrees exactly with the LXX. The Hebrew word rendered "*unprofitable*," means literally "corrupt," as sour milk. See note on Ps. xiv. 3.

*there is none that doeth good, no, not one.*] Heb. "not even one;" LXX, "there is not even to one."

Here the quotation from Ps. xiv. ends; but the other passages quoted in *vv.* 13–18, from various Psalms and from Isaiah, are interpolated in Ps. xiv., in some MSS. of the LXX, in the Vulgate, and thence in our Prayer Book Version. Probably the whole passage from Romans was written at first in the margin, and thence crept into the text of the Psalm. Other examples of this reflex action of quotation upon the text of the LXX. are found in Ps. xiv. 1; Isai. lii. 5, &c. See note on ii. 24.

**13.** *Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit.*] Taken exactly from the LXX of Ps. v. 9. As the grave that stands ready opened will presently be filled with death and corruption, so the throat (larynx) of the wicked opened for speech will be full of corrupt and deadly falsehood. Compare Jerem. v. 16: "*Their quiver is an open sepulchre.*"

*have used deceit.*] Literally, "were deceiving:" for the form ἐδολιοῦσαν see Winer, P. II. § xiii. 2 f. The Hebrew of Ps. v. 9, means literally "make smooth their tongue:" A.V. "*flatter with their tongue*," cf. Prov. ii. 16.

*the poison of asps is under their lips.*] Ps. cxl. 3. The venom of falsehood is as deadly as adder's poison.

**14.** *Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.*] Ps. x. 7; compare Job xx 14, 16. The poison of asps was supposed to lie in the bitter gall, and hence "*bitterness*" is a figure for venomous malice. "*Throat*," "*tongue*," "*lips*" mark the successive stages by which speech comes forth: the "*mouth*" sums up all in one (Bengel).

**15-17.** Abridged from the LXX of Isai. lix. 7, 8, where see Notes.

**18.** From Ps. xxxvi. 1 (LXX.)

We must now ask how far these passages confirm the charge of universal sinfulness, in support of which they are alleged.

In Ps. xiv. 1-3, David declares that the Lord looking down from heaven upon "the children of men" could find none righteous; no, not one. It seems impossible to frame a more positive assertion of universal sinfulness: and if in *vv.* 4, 5, we find a people of God, and a "generation of the righteous," the inconsistency between this and the former statement of the Psalmist is only apparent and external. In the deep inner sense which St. Paul gives to the passage, "the generation of the righteous" would be the first to acknowledge that they form no exception to the universal sinfulness asserted in the opening verses of the Psalm.

The quotations in *vv.* 13, 14, from Pss. v. 9, cxl. 3, and x. 7 refer to the Psalmist's enemies, or to the wicked as a class, and contain no assertion of universal sinfulness.

The passage quoted in *vv.* 15–17, from Isaiah lix. 7, 8, is distinctly directed against the unrighteousness of Israel. The last quotation (*v.* 18) from Ps. xxxvi. 1, describes the state of a wicked man, without any reference to the universality of sin.

Thus the first quotation confirms in its whole extent the Apostle's statement that Jews as well as Gentiles are all under sin, while the other passages supply particular illustrations of the general truth, and some of them are directed to the very point of the Apostle's argument, that the Jews are not exempt from the general sinfulness.

It may possibly be objected that the charge of universal apostasy in Ps. xiv. applies only to some particular generation, and not to all time.

If the objection were valid, it would not affect St. Paul's argument: the quotation would still prove as much as he uses it to prove, and more. For the nature of the

Digitized by Google

things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become [1]guilty before God.

20 Therefore by the deeds of the

[1] Or, *subject to the judgment of God.*

---

proof employed by the Apostle is very often misunderstood.

A demonstrative proof that every man is a sinner, is from the nature of the case impossible. St. Paul's method is this: he first brings the charge of actual sin against all, Gentiles and Jews, and appeals to notorious facts for proof of the general truth of the charge, leaving its individual application to every man's conscience (i. 18-iii. 9).

He then shows that this charge of universal sinfulness is illustrated and confirmed by various statements of the Old Testament concerning the Jews and men in general: and the passages cited would bear all that is thus laid upon them, even if they were less explicit as to universality of sin than some of them are.

One caution, though very obvious, is not unnecessary: the doctrines of universal sinfulness and of justification by faith are perfectly consistent with the existence of a true righteousness both under the Law and before the Law. We have seen above that the one strongest and most absolute assertion of universal sinfulness in Ps. xiv. 1-3 is immediately followed by the mention of a people of God (*v.* 4), and a *generation of the righteous* (*v.* 5). St. Paul's own disciple does not hesitate to say that Zacharias and Elizabeth were "both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke i. 6).

Such a righteousness of "holy and humble men of heart" was the very opposite of the self-righteousness condemned by St. Paul, which relied, not on God's mercy, but on man's own works, and used the ordinances of the Law as means of merit, not of grace.

The Gospel more clearly revealed, but did not alter, the nature of faith and righteousness: it enlarged the object of faith, added new motives to obedience, and ministered in richer abundance the sanctifying graces of God's Spirit.

We should observe also that the point which the Apostle is here establishing is not the *doctrine* of original or birth-sin (as in v. 12), but the *fact* of universal sinfulness: and even those who reject the doctrine do not deny the fact.

**19, 20.** An explanation of the connexion and meaning of these verses will be best introduced by a revised translation: **But** *we know that what things soever the law saith, it* **speaketh** *to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may* **come under God's judgment: because by works of law** *shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for* **through law cometh knowledge** *of sin.*

**19.** This verse is generally understood as an assertion that all the Old Testament Scriptures, and therefore the passages just quoted from the Psalms and Isaiah, speak to the Jew in order that his mouth, as well as every other, may be stopped by the denunciation of his sin.

But this interpretation is open to serious objections.

(1) It rests on the very doubtful assumption that St. Paul may have included the Prophets and Psalms under the name of "the Law:" whereas this extension of the name is found only in two or three passages of St. John's Gospel, and is contrary to St. Paul's usage, 1 Cor. xiv. 21 being the one doubtful exception.

(2) This extended meaning of "*the Law*," even if it were not unusual in St. Paul's writings, would be inadmissible here, being opposed in two respects to the immediate context. (*a*) In *v.* 21 "the Law" is expressly distinguished from "the Prophets." (*b*) In the sentence "the Law speaks to them that are under the Law," the term must evidently have the same meaning in both places, and in the latter it clearly means the Mosaic code.

(3) The usual interpretation does not agree with the course of the argument at this point.

The passages from the Psalms and Isaiah have been brought to confirm the charge already made against Jew and Gentile, "*that they are all under sin.*" But it was necessary to prove more than this in the case of the Jew, in order that his "*mouth might be stopped*" and that he might "**be brought under the judgment of God:**" for we have seen already that the Jews openly claimed exemption from final condemnation, even for wicked Israelites: See note on ii. 3.

The purpose therefore of *v.* 19 is not to show that the Scripture describes the Jew as a sinner, but that, being a sinner, he is in danger of the judgment. These three reasons, and especially the last, compel us to reject the common interpretation of this verse, and to take a different view of the connexion of the whole passage, *vv.* 9-20, which is as follows:

"We are not in any way claiming a superiority (or, putting forward an excuse) which may exempt the Jew from condemnation. For the charge which we before brought (cc. i. ii.), and which Scripture confirms (iii. 10-18), is that all, Jew as well as Gentile, are under sin.

"But the law, far from giving to the Jew

Digitized by Google

law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law *is* the knowledge of sin.

21 But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;

22 Even the righteousness of God

---

impunity for his sin, speaks in all that it says, especially to him as its subject, in order that he first (and so all the world), may be put to silence, and brought under God's judgment."

*it saith*] **it speaketh.** In all that the Law "*saith*" (λέγει), *i.e.* in all the commandments which it contains, it **speaketh** (λαλεῖ) to those who are "*under the Law*," as the Dispensation in which they live.

*that every mouth may be stopped*] Compare Job v. 16; Ps. lxiii. 10; cvii. 42. The mouth is stopped, when every excuse is taken away.

*become guilty before God*] **Come under God's judgment**, or more exactly, "become accountable to God" (ὑπόδικος τῷ Θεῷ). The word is not used elsewhere in the N. T. or LXX, but is common in Plato and the Attic Orators: it means "liable to prosecution," and a Dative following it refers either to the violated law, or to the rightful prosecutor. God is thus represented as having a controversy against sinners (Job ix. 3; Jer. xxv. 31; Mic. vi. 1); but since He is also their Judge (*v.* 20), we may fairly translate the words as above, "**come under God's judgment.**"

20. *Therefore*] **Because** (διότι): this word introduces the reason why every mouth shall be stopped and all brought under judgment. The sense of the whole passage (9–20) is perverted by the erroneous rendering "*therefore*," which the A.V. first brought into the English Bible. The failure of the Jew to justify himself before God is here traced to a cause which is common to all, namely, the weakness of sinful man indicated in the term "flesh." This term (πᾶσα σάρξ) St. Paul substitutes for πᾶς ζῶν, "every man living," by which the LXX more exactly renders the Hebrew: "all flesh" conveys the idea of universal frailty and sinfulness; see Gen. vi. 12). The same passage (Ps. cxliii. 2) is quoted in the same form in Gal. ii. 16. In both instances St. Paul prefaces the quotation by the words ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, **by works of law**, a definition of the Psalmist's meaning both correct in itself and necessary in the application to the Apostle's argument. Observe, however, that the statement being universal and not limited to the Jews, the Apostle does not write "*the works of the law*," but "**works of law**," because he is stating a general truth which results from the nature of law, as being a thing which cannot give life and righteousness (Gal. iii. 21). See Introduction § 9. His meaning is, that no man shall obtain justification from the source whence the Jew seeks it, namely, from the merit of works done in obedience to a law.

Thus, when the Jew is put to silence, every mouth is stopped: none can say after his condemnation, that they could attain to righteousness by their own obedience, if only they had a law to teach them what God requires. There is no contradiction between the statement in ii. 13, "*the doers of* **law** *shall be justified:*" and this passage, "**by works of law** *shall no flesh be justified:*" the former states the abstract principle or condition of legal justification: the latter declares that no man can fulfil that condition.

*for by the law is the knowledge of sin.*] **For through law cometh knowledge of sin.** A reason why none can be justified through law: for law has the very opposite effect; through it first comes a clear knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, as in i. 28) of sin. This weighty thought is taken up again and developed in vii. 7 ff. We are there taught how the commandment draws out the sinful lust which it condemns, but cannot subdue; and how the law has done all that it can do, when the sinner is forced to exclaim, "*O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?*"

### 21-26. The Righteousness of God Revealed.

"The opening of a brighter scene." (Bengel.) St. Paul has shown the universal need of righteousness (i. 18—iii. 20), and now turns from the negative to the positive side of the theme proposed in i. 17.

21. "*But now*," marks the contrast between the times of the old and new dispensations, as in *v.* 26, and xvi. 26.

"Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo."

*the righteousness of God without the law is manifested.*] "**Apart from law a righteousness of God has been manifested.**"

The words "**apart from law**," put in close and emphatic contrast to "**through law**" (*v.* 20), shew that the actual manifestation of "God's righteousness" has been quite independent of "**law**," *i.e.* not only the law of Moses, but the whole principle of law and legal obedience.

"**a righteousness of God.**" See note on i. 17. A more complete definition of this righteousness follows in *vv.* 22–26.

"**has been manifested.**" Having pre-

Digitized by Google

*which is* by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:

23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;

24 Being justified freely by his

---

viously been hidden in God's counsels it has now been made manifest in historical reality in the person of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. i. 30), "**Who was manifested in flesh, justified in Spirit,** *seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory*" (1 Tim. iii. 16). The manifestation in fact is complete (πεφανέρωται); the revelation in the Gospel still goes on (ἀποκαλύπτεται, i. 17).

*being witnessed by the law and the prophets.*] It was necessary that the manifestation of the righteousness of God should be absolutely independent of law; that the true mode of obtaining it, viz. by faith in Christ Jesus, might be set beyond reach of doubt. Nevertheless, "*the law*" of Moses has not been without its use negatively, in producing a knowledge of sin (*v.* 20), and positively, in bearing witness in common with the Prophets to the coming dispensation of righteousness. This testimony of Scripture includes all types, promises, and prophecies of Christ: for "to him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts x. 43; xxviii. 23). We have an example of the way in which St. Paul uses this testimony in c. iv.

**22.** *Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.*] Read, "**Even a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ.**" The subject of *v.* 21 is repeated with a more precise definition distinct from (δέ) though not opposed to the preceding. Compare ix. 30; Phil. ii. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 6. The points more precisely defined are the means by which righteousness is attained, and its destined extent.

"**through faith in Jesus Christ.**" Justifying faith is here presented, not as a faith in God of which Christ is the author (Van Hengel, &c.), but as faith in Christ Himself: compare Mark xi. 22; Gal. ii. 16, 20; iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; iv. 13; Phil. iii. 9. "The Person of Christ in its unity and totality ('*Jesus Christ*') is the proper redemptive object of faith" (Dorner, 'Person of Christ,' P. II ii. p. 113).

*unto all and upon all them that believe.*] Tischendorf and most modern editors read with the more ancient MSS. "unto all them that believe:" the variation does not materially affect the sense, but the emphatic repetition of "all" with different prepositions, is very characteristic of St. Paul (xi. 36; Gal. i. 1; Eph. iv. 6 (Col. i. 16). If both are retained, "*unto all*" marks the destination and "*upon all,*" or "over all," the extension which the "*righteousness of God*" is to have, both being limited to "*them that believe.*"

Faith in Christ thus presented as the sole condition of righteousness is not regarded by St. Paul as a restriction of God's grace, but as the means of participation by which alone it can be thrown open to all mankind. Faith has itself a universal fitness for man: it grows out of his original relation to God, and is, under all circumstances, the rightful disposition of the creature towards his Creator. In man unfallen it was the trustful loving sense of dependence upon God's goodness: in fallen man it unites the deep feeling of unworthiness with the conviction that mercy rejoices against judgment; and thus in both states gives God the glory.

Faith therefore is not an arbitrary condition imposed upon us from without, but a law of our true nature: it exalts man to his rightful dignity by allowing the free consent of his will, and the active exercise of his faculties, and yet humbles him before God in acknowledgment of mercy undeserved. Thus faith is at once the soul's highest exercise of freedom, its lowliest "confession of sin," and the only homage it can render to God.

*for there is no difference.*] The righteousness of God by faith is for *all*, "**for there is no distinction**" made therein, but Gentile and Jew are all included in the same method of salvation: and the reason why no distinction is made is that there is no difference in their need (*v.* 23).

**23.** *For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.*] The older English versions mark more correctly the difference of the tenses, and the meaning of ὑστερεῖσθαι: "For all have sinned, and are destitute of the glory of God" (Cranmer, Geneva): "**For all men sinned, and have need** *of the glory of God*" (Wyclif). The subjective force of the Middle Voice ("to *feel* want") will be clearly perceived by contrasting the self-complacent question of the rich young Ruler, "*What lack I yet?*" (Matt. xix. 20, ὑστερῶ) with the description of the Prodigal, when "*he began to be in want*" and to feel it (Luke xv. 14, ὑστερεῖσθαι). The sinning is represented by the aorist as an historic fact, already proved: its present and continued effect is that men not only come short of (ὑστερεῖν) but suffer want (ὑστερεῖσθαι) and feel themselves destitute of "*the glory of God.*"

The meaning of this last expression is much disputed, but instead of discussing the various

Digitized by Google

grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:

25 Whom God hath [1]set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his

[1] Or, *foreordained.*

---

meanings which have been invented for it, we shall better enter into St. Paul's conception of "*the glory of God,*" by combining the chief aspects in which he regards it.

In i. 23 "the glory of the incorruptible God" is (in the words of Hooker, 'E. P.' ii. 2, § 1) "the admirable excellence of that virtue Divine, which being made manifest causeth men and angels to extol his greatness."

This "glory of God" not only manifests, but communicates itself, being reflected in such of His creatures as are capable of knowing and loving and growing like Him. St. Paul therefore, in 1 Cor. xi. 7, calls the man "the image and glory of God," because he is capable of receiving and reflecting God's glory. Compare Irenæus iii. 20, § 2: "The glory of man is God, and of the operation of God, and of all His wisdom and power, man is the receptacle:" and iv. 16, § 4: "man was in want of the glory of God."

See also Hooker 'E. P.' I. xi. § 2, "then are we happy, therefore, when fully we enjoy God as an object wherein the powers of our soul are satisfied even with everlasting delight: so that although we be men, yet by being unto God united, we live as it were, the life of God."

The complete manifestation of Divine perfection is "*the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,*" or in other words, "**the glory of Christ**, *who is the image* of God" (2 Cor. iv. 4, 6).

This glory of God in Christ shining forth in the Gospel upon the believer's heart transforms him into "light in the Lord" (Eph. v. 8): and so "*we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory*" (2 Cor. iii. 18).

The transformation begins here, but man's full participation in "the glory of God" is the hope of our high calling reserved for us in heaven (c. v. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14).

**24.** *Being justified freely by his grace.*] The Present Participle "*being justified*" is closely connected with the preceding clause, as its necessary accompaniment (ὑστεροῦνται—δικαιούμενοι): they who through sin suffer loss of the glory of God can receive justification only as a free gift by his grace.

"The glory of God" thus restored in Man as His image, is rightly called "the perfection of his grace." Severianus, Cram. Cat. in loc.; ὑστερεῖ αὐτοῖς ἡ τῆς χάριτος τελείωσις. Thus instead of making *v.* 23 a formal parenthesis, and then resuming his subject in a new sentence, St. Paul, as his manner is (see on *v.* 26), glides back without any formal break into the main course of his argument. For the meaning of "justified," see note on ii. 13: it is there used of one supposed to be actually "just" before being declared so by God, here of those who before were sinners, but now are both declared and *made righteous.* See note on ch. v. 19, and the passage quoted from Bp. Bull, 'Examen Censuræ,' § 17, in our Introduction § 9.

We learn from this verse that the justification of the believer takes place—(1) as a free gift, not as a reward or acknowledgment of a righteousness already existing in him; (2) "*by his grace*" there being a slight emphasis on the Pronoun, which contrasts God's grace, *i.e.* free unbought love, with man's merits or works (Eph. ii. 8); (3) "*through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,*" this being the instrument or means on God's part, as "*faith in Jesus Christ,*" *v.* 22, is on man's part.

*the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.*] "*Redemption*" is here explained by Origen as a "ransom" paid in Christ's blood to Satan for the release of his captives. This notion, so common until the time of Anselm, is derived from the Greek and Latin words (ἀπολύτρωσις, redemptio), not from the Hebrew. In the O. T. the great typical act, which fixes the idea of redemption, is the deliverance from Egypt. Jehovah is the Redeemer or Deliverer (גאל), who demands the release of His people: "*Israel is my son, even my first-born: and I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me: and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born*" (Ex. iv. 22, 23): "*I will redeem you* (גאלתי) *with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments*" (Ex. vi. 6; xv. 13). The purpose of the redemption is the consecration of Israel to God's service: "*I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God*" (Ex. vi. 7). Jehovah pays no ransom to the oppressor, but from His people He requires an act of faith, in the sacrifice of the Passover, and an act of holy obedience in the consecration of the first-born (Ex. xiii. 1; xix. 4–6). These types are united and fulfilled in "*Christ our Passover:*" He is both "*the Lamb that was slain*" (Rev. v. 12; John i. 29; 1 Cor. v. 7), and "*the first-born from the dead*" (Cor. i. 18). Thus "*The redemption*" is "*in Christ Jesus,*" not in any act or work, the effect of which might be separated from the agent, but in Himself (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14), "in His person with which His work forms a living unity" (Olshausen, Eph. i. 7): Having lived and died and lived again for us, He is "*of God made unto us*

Digitized by Google

blood, to declare his righteousness for the [1]remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;

[1] Or, *passing over.*

. . . *redemption*" (1 Cor. i. 30), being in Himself the redeemer (Tit. ii. 14), the ransom (1 Tim. ii. 6), and the redeemed as "*the first-born among many brethren*" (viii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 23; Rev. i. 5).

The ransom is more closely defined as "*his life*" or "*soul*" (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45), and "*his blood*" (1 Pet. i. 19).

As to the extent of the redemption, it is for Israel (Luke i. 68; ii. 32; xxiv. 21), for "*many*" (Matt. xx. 28; Mar. x. 45), for "*all*" (1 Tim. ii. 6), for "*the purchased possession*" (Eph. i. 14).

It redeems from sin and its penalties (Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Pet. i. 18; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14), particularly from death (Rom. viii. 23; compare Heb. xi. 35), and generally from the present evil state into a state of glory and blessing (Luke xxi. 28; Eph. iv. 30).

**25, 26.** A further explanation of God's method of justification "*through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.*"

*Whom God hath set forth.*] Two interpretations of the verb are admissible. (1) "Whom God set before His own mind," proposed to himself, and so "designed," "proposed," "ordained" (Wiclif). The Margin "fore-ordained" is less correct, precedence in time not being expressed by the πρό, but only implied in the idea of design or purpose; "quod nondum est, proponitur" (Origen).

This is the more ancient interpretation, being found in the Syriac ("prædestinavit," Schaaf), Origen, Chrysostom, Gennadius in Œcumenius, and others.

It also agrees with the *meaning* of the Verb in the N. T. (Rom. i. 13; Eph. i. 9), though not with its construction, as an Infinitive usually follows.

(2) "*Whom God set forth,*" *i.e.* "publicly before the eyes of all, that he who will be redeemed may draw nigh" (Pelagius). This sense is supported by classical usage (Herod. iii. 148; Eurip. 'Phœn.' 1330, *Hec.* 613), by the Vulgate, Cranmer, Geneva, A.V., and the majority of modern interpreters.

In the LXX the Verb occurs thrice in the Middle Voice, but in a sense slightly differing from either of the above: Ps. liv. 3; ("they have not set God before them,") Pss. lxxxvi. 14, and ci. 3.

The meaning "*Whom God set forth*" is best suited to the idea, made so prominent in this passage, of a public exhibition: and the Middle Voice indicates that God himself was interested in thus setting forth His own Son as a propitiation to show forth His righteousness. With either meaning, the Father is the author of our redemption.

*to be a propitiation.*] **as a Propitiatory,** *i.e.* a mercy seat. For a full discussion of the Greek word ἱλαστήριον, see Note at end of chapter.

Amid all the variety of rendering the essential meaning of the word remains sure; it represents Christ as making *propitiation* for sinners, and so obtaining mercy and forgiveness for them.

Moreover, the all-important truth that the efficacy of Christ's propitiation lies "*in his blood,*" *i.e.* in His dying as a sacrifice for sin, shines out too clear in the context to be obscured by any possible rendering of the word ἱλαστήριον.

*through faith in his blood.*] The clause "*through faith,*" omitted in A, and not interpreted by Chrysostom, is authenticated by the consent of all other MSS., Fathers, and Versions, and confirmed by the recurrence of ἐκ πίστεως at the close of *v.* 26. The absence of the Greek Article does not affect the English translation, nor the connexion of the clause with the context.

The following considerations might be thought to favour the connexion given in the A. V.

(*a*) That the construction "*faith in His blood*" is grammatically correct, is clear from Eph. i. 15, τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ: where the absence of a second article after πίστιν shows that it is structurally connected and fused into one idea with ἐν τῷ Κ. Ἰ., the substantive πίστις taking the same construction as the Verb, πιστεύειν ἐν (Meyer, Fritzsche). Compare LXX Ps. lxxviii. 22, οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ; Jer. xii. 6, μὴ πιστεύσῃς ἐν αὐτοῖς: Mark i. 15.

(*b*) The objection that no other example is found in Scripture of such an expression as "belief in the blood of Christ," is set aside by the equally unexampled expressions "*justified* in *his blood*" (v. 9), and "*made nigh* in *the blood of Christ*" (Eph. ii. 13).

(*c*) That the expression is not inappropriate is thus proved by Bp. O'Brien, 'Nature of Faith,' Note P. p. 383.

"If we are told that the *Blood* of Christ was shed for the remission of our sins (Mark xiv. 24); that we are justified by (in) His *Blood* (Rom. v. 9); that we have redemption through His *Blood* (Eph. i. 7); that He made peace through the *Blood* of His Cross (Col. i. 20); that those who were afar off were made nigh by (in) "His *Blood*" (Eph. ii. 13); that He purchased the Church of God with His own *Blood* (Acts xx. 28); that He has washed us from our sins in His own *Blood* (Rev. i. 5), that through His *Blood* we have

Digitized by Google

26 To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

---

boldness to enter into the Holiest (Heb. x. 19); if all this . . . . is declared concerning the efficacy of His *Blood*, it can hardly be thought strange that it should be anywhere stated that His *Blood* is the object of the *faith* of His people."

But still, though the expression "*faith in his blood*" (Post-Communion Prayer) is in itself unobjectionable, the context of the present passage requires that the element in which lies the inherent power of Christ's Atonement, viz., His blood, should not be introduced as a subordinate point, merely to define more closely the subjective condition, man's faith, but should hold a more prominent and independent position in the sentence (Meyer, Philippi, &c.).

This argument is much strengthened by the emphatic position of αὐτοῦ, rightly explained by the Greek Fathers. "The Propitiatory of old was itself bloodless, since it was also without life, but it received the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifices: but the Lord Christ and God is at once Propitiatory, High Priest, and Lamb, and in His own blood (οἰκείῳ αἵματι) negotiated our salvation, requiring only faith from us" (Theodoret). The two clauses "*through faith*," and "*in His* **own** *blood*," are therefore parallel, and both depend on ἱλαστήριον: render, therefore, "**Whom God set forth as a Propitiatory through faith in His own blood.**" Compare Heb. ix. 12, 25.

*to declare his righteousness.*] "**for an exhibition of** *his righteousness*." This direct purpose (εἰς), and chief final cause for which God set forth Christ, is afterwards more fully explained in the words εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, κ.τ.λ.

The connexion of the whole passage (*vv.* 21–26) makes it clear that *His righteousness* here is the same "*righteousness of God*" which is spoken of in *vv.* 21, 22. There the Apostle defines its relation to the Law, and the means and extent of its appropriation by man; here he points to an exhibition of the same righteousness as it exists under a twofold aspect in God its author and source: He is Himself just, and justifies the believer in Jesus. His is at once a sin-condemning and sin-forgiving righteousness.

The various interpretations "truthfulness," "goodness," "holiness," "judicial righteousness," "punitive righteousness," &c., all fail to satisfy the context, because they substitute an arbitrary and limited idea of righteousness for that "*righteousness of God*," which it is the very purpose of the passage to exhibit in all the fulness of its manifestation.

*for the remission of sins that are past.*] "**because of the passing over of the sins that had gone before.**" See Delitzsch, Heb. ix. 15.

In thus distinguishing, with the Margin, between πάρεσις "prætermission," "passing by," and ἄφεσις "remission," *i.e.*, full release and dismissal of sins, we are treading on the ashes of a fierce but extinct controversy concerning the remission of sins under the Mosaic dispensation, of which a brief notice may be found in Trench, 'Synonyms of N. T.,' 1st series, p. 133.

We must also observe that the word here used for sins, ἁμαρτήματα, is comparatively rare (Mark iii. 28; iv. 12; 1 Cor. vi. 18) and denotes the sinful deeds done, not the essential sin ἁμαρτία, of which they are the outcomings. It is joined with παριέναι in Josephus, 'Antt.' xv. 3, 2, and in Xenophon, 'Hipparch.' vii. 10, "It is not right to let offences pass by unpunished."

"When the son of Sirach (Ecclus. xxiii. 2) prays to God that He *would not* '*pass by*' his sins,—he assuredly does not use οὐ μὴ παρῇ as = οὐ μὴ ἀφῇ, but only asks that he may not be left without a wholesome chastisement following close on his transgressions." (Trench, *l. c.*)

The contrast between "*this present time*" and the "**sins that had gone before**" shows that the foregone sins of which St. Paul here speaks are not those of individuals before conversion, but "*the sins of the world before Christ*" (Meyer), including "the transgressions that were under the first testament," *i. e.* the sins of the Jews (Heb. ix. 15).

Those foregone sins God had let pass for the time without adequate expiation or punishment. His wrath which had been revealed from heaven against all ungodliness (i. 18) was not a complete vindication of His holiness, for though the sins against which it was denounced were increased and aggravated (i. 24–32), yet He did not suffer His whole displeasure to arise, but, with rare exceptions, His justice seemed to slumber.

*through the forbearance*] **in** *the forbearance.* This overlooking of sins has its cause "**in** *the forbearance of God*," an expression which clearly distinguishes it from the remission of sins, which is the effect of His grace and favour.

"Forbearance" (ii. 4) is a temporary suspension of anger, "a truce with the sinner, which by no means implies that the wrath will not be executed at the last; nay, involves that it certainly will, unless he be

Digitized by Google

27 Where *is* boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith.

---

found under new conditions" (Trench, 2nd Series, p. 15).

One effect of God's forbearance is to obscure for the time His righteousness: "*These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself*" (Ps. l. 21; compare Eccl. viii. 11–13). Thus in the impunity of sin during the times of ignorance that God winked at (Acts xvii. 30), there arose a secondary cause, for an exhibition of His righteousness, (διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν, κ.τ.λ.) a cause having reference only to His mode of dealing with the sins of the generations which lived before Christ. But the primary cause of that exhibition of His righteousness was not the need of a "Divine Théodicée of the past history of mankind" (Tholuck), but the forgiveness of the sins of all ages, even unto the end of the world.

**26.** *To declare, I say, his righteousness.*] "**in view of the exhibition of his righteousness.**" The A. V. treats this as a mere resumption of εἰς ἔνδειξιν κ. τ. λ. in *v.* 25, in which case the change of expression (πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν) becomes, as Meyer confesses, unmeaning.

But connect the clause with that which immediately precedes, and all is clear: God set forth Christ **for an exhibition** of His righteousness—because He had let the sins of former generations pass for the time unpunished **in view of the exhibition** of his righteousness at this present time—that he might be just, &c. The passage thus construed, is a striking example of a well-known peculiarity in St. Paul's style, of which an exactly parallel case is found in Eph. iii. 3, 4, 5: he "goes off at a word" (μυστήριον), in order to connect with it some accessory thought, which he follows out until it brings him back to the same word again (ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ), and then glides back into the main line of the sentence without any parenthesis or other formal interruption of the grammatical construction (See above on *v.* 24.)

Here he goes off at the word ἔνδειξιν in order to bring in a subordinate reason for such an "**exhibition**" which might otherwise have been overlooked (διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν κ. τ. λ.), and with this thought, and by means of it, works round to the same word again (πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν). The Article is required by the renewed mention of ἔνδειξις, which is the same exhibition as before, but in accordance with the mention of the sins of former times is now more nearly defined as "**the exhibition in this present time,**" even this addition of ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ being an exact parallel to the addition τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Eph. iii. 4.

"The time of Christ is a time of critical decision, when the πάρεσις is at an end, and man must either accept the full remission (ἄφεσις) of sin, or expose himself to the judgment of a righteous God" (Schaff).

The clause "in this present time" points to the contrast of former ages. "*The righteousness of God*" then partially obscured, has been clearly manifested and exhibited "*in this present time,*" i. e. the time subsequent to Christ's death.

*that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.*] *That he might* **himself** *be just, &c.* There are some remarkable illustrations of this antithetical expression in some of the Rabbinical comments on Isai. liii. 11:

"His (Messiah's) true perfection will consist, first of all, in his perfecting himself as far as possible in the service, the fear, and the love of God, and afterwards in conferring the same perfection upon others, as is done by the Almighty himself."

"Moses, more than any one else, helped to make others perfect, according to the saying, *Moses was just and justified many.*"

"Moses was worthy himself, and made many others worthy as well" (Neubauer, 'The Jewish Interpreters of Isai.' liii. pp. 325, 339, 287).

The exhibition of the righteousness of God had a double purpose: Christ was therein set forth (1) as "**propitiatory** *in his blood*" to show that God is Himself "just," *i.e.*, to vindicate His righteousness against the seeming impunity of sins in former ages, and (2) as "**propitiatory** *through faith,*" to show that God is the author of righteousness to them that believe. "The righteousness of God is shown especially in this, that He so utterly hates sin, that in order to destroy it, and make man righteous, He sent His own Son into the world, and gave Him up to death" (Estius).

Calvin's interpretation, though not strictly derived from the context, like that which has been given above, is not inconsistent with it, and is worth quoting briefly: "This is a definition of that righteousness which was exhibited in the gift of Christ, and revealed in the Gospel (i. 17). It consists of two parts: (1) God is righteous, not as one among many, but as containing in Himself alone all fulness of righteousness: God alone is righteous, and all mankind unrighteous. But (2) God's righteousness is communicative: He pours it forth on man. In us,

Digitized by Google

28 Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.

29 *Is he* the God of the Jews only? *is he* not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also:

---

therefore, the righteousness of God is reflected, inasmuch as He justifies us by faith in Christ."

*him which believeth in Jesus.*] Literally—"**him that is of faith in Jesus,**" *i.e.*, him that has faith in Jesus as the root of his relation to God, in opposition to them that are of the law or of works: see note on ii. 7.

27-31. RESULTS OF GOD'S METHOD OF JUSTIFICATION.

Looking back on his whole previous argument from i. 18, and more especially on the representation in iii. 21-26, of "the righteousness of God by faith," St. Paul now proceeds to draw out some of its grand results: (1) that it gives glory, not to man, but to God only (*vv.* 27, 28); (2) that it includes Jew and Gentile in one universal method of Salvation (29, 30); (3) that it establishes Divine law on its true basis (31).

*Where is boasting then?* "**Where then is the boasting?**" It is true that all human glorying is equally excluded, but the question has special reference (as the Article shows) to the boasting before mentioned (ii. 17, 23), namely that of the Jew, which he has been combating throughout the whole section (ii. 17—iii. 20). It is this sense of conflict brought to a victorious end, that gives so triumphant a tone to the Apostle's question, the tone of a conqueror looking round for an adversary who has already disappeared (1 Cor. i. 20; xv. 55).

*It is excluded.*] Though there can never really be room for any boasting on man's part before God, yet boasting will intrude; nor can it be shut out "**by the law of works,**" which rather tends to foster self-righteousness. But "**a law of faith,**" a dispensation which says, not "This do, and thou shalt live," but "Believe, and thou shalt be saved," at once shuts out all boasting: for to believe is to trust not in ourselves, but in God, to feel ourselves helpless, to confess ourselves unworthy, and to cast ourselves with full confidence upon God's mercy in Christ.

*By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith.*] Read—"**By what manner of law? (By the law) of works? Nay; but by a law of faith.**"

St. Paul's exact and significant use of the Article is disregarded in the A. V., and misinterpreted by Lange: "Since the Mosaic law was a law of works in form only, and not in spirit (see vii. 7), the question presupposes that there is no such law of works: the spirit of the law is the law of faith." This refined distinction between the form and spirit of the law of Moses is out of place. The article before ἔργων shows that the clause must be completed thus—διὰ τοῦ νόμου τῶν ἔργων; Instead of presupposing that there is no such law of works, the question in fact presupposes that "the (definite) law of works" is well-known. Accordingly "**a law** *of faith*" does not mean the law of Moses recognised in its spirit as being a law of faith (Lange): but the Gospel is called "**a law** *of faith*," because, like the Mosaic law, it declares *the will of God*, only what it demands is *faith*, for "*this is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent*" (Joh. vi. 29; compare 1 Joh. iii. 23).

28. *Therefore we conclude.*] **For we deem** (Wiclif). The reading γάρ, now confirmed by the Sinaitic Codex, is necessary to the sense. What the context requires is a confirmation of the statement in *v.* 27, that boasting is excluded by a law of *faith*. That confirmation St. Paul brings from the general principle already established by the whole previous discussion that "**man** *is justified by faith* **apart from works of law:**" compare the words "**apart from law,**" in *v.* 21. That "*man is justified by faith,*" proves that faith is necessary to the Jew: that man is justified without or apart from "**works of law,**" proves that "*the works of the law*" are not required of the Gentile. Thus the boasting of the Jew is wholly excluded: for not only is the law (in which he had made his boast) insufficient without faith, but faith is sufficient without the law: compare note on *v.* 30, and Gal. ii. 14-16.

On the word "*man,*" Chrysostom's comment is excellent. "He says not 'Jew,' nor 'he that is under the law;' but having enlarged the area of his argument, and opened the doors of salvation to the world, he says 'man,' using the name common to the nature."

29. *Is he the God of the Jews only?*] The exact rendering would be "Or is God of Jews only?" but in an English Version it is better to repeat the word "God:" "**Or is God (a God) of Jews only? Not of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also.**" A question which confirms the statement of *v.* 28, by alleging as the necessary alternative what is manifestly impossible. Compare on this use of ἤ, notes on vi. 3; vii. 1; ix. 21; xi. 2.

Man must be justified by faith without

Digitized by Google

30 Seeing *it is* one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

31 Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.

works of law, *or else* the justification which God has provided depends on a condition, which none can fulfil but they which are under the law. God would thus shew that He cared for none but Jews, and belonged to them only.

**30.** *Seeing it is one God.*] "**If so be that God is one.**" The proof that God is God of Gentiles as well as of Jews, lies in the first fundamental article of the Jews' religion, that Jehovah is God alone, even the God of all the kingdoms of the earth. See 2 Ki. xix. 15; Isaiah xliv. 6; Deut. vi. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 4–6; 1 Tim. ii. 4–6. The difference between ἐπείπερ ("*seeing that*") and εἴπερ ("**if so be that**") affects the rhetorical form only, and not the logical cogency of the argument.

With εἴπερ St. Paul does not himself assert the absolute certainty of the statement "**God is one,**" but knowing it to be in fact as absolutely certain for his readers as for himself, puts it before them to decide. Compare 2 Thess. i. 6.

*which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.*] "**Who will justify circumcision,**" &c. The truth that "**God is one,**" having been alleged to prove that He is God of Gentiles as well as of Jews, St. Paul now appends to it, as a corollary, the unity of His plan of justification for all. This is the connexion: "Yes, of Gentiles also, since God is one; and so His plan of justification by faith will include both Jew and Gentile."

"It is not to be supposed," says Origen, "that St. Paul has varied his use of prepositions at random." His use of the article is equally free from caprice, and when we fail to discern the meaning of some nice distinction in the Apostle's choice of words, it is more reasonable to impute the want of discrimination to ourselves than to him.

The usual distinction between ἐξ and διά is, that ἐξ indicates the origin, source, or root, *i.e.* the primary cause: διά, the intervening, instrumental, and so the subsidiary cause, means, or condition.

Here, accordingly, ἐκ πίστεως is used of the Jew, to indicate that whatever may be his present condition and privilege, the real source and root of justification (so far as it depends on himself) must be faith. And faith being something new which the Jew has not yet got, πίστις is used without the article.

In regard to the Gentile, the point in dispute was not whether his justification had its origin in faith, but whether his faith in Christ was sufficient to justify him without circumcision and the law. The two opposite views of this question might be thus expressed:

(1) δικαιοῦται ἐκ πίστεως διὰ νόμου καὶ περιτομῆς.

(2) δικαιοῦται ἐκ πίστεως καὶ διὰ τῆς πίστεως χωρὶς νόμου.

The second view, which is St. Paul's, means that in the justification of the Gentile, the faith which he already has, supplies the place of all subsidiary means, such as circumcision and the law. Compare note on *v.* 28.

**31.** *Do we then make void the law through faith?*] "**Law**" (without the article), means neither the O. T. Scriptures (see on *v.* 19), which St. Paul does not assume to establish by his doctrine, but conversely, his doctrine by the Scriptures; nor "the law of Moses," as the basis of the Jewish Dispensation, nor any particular law, but that which is common to all law, its essential character and principle. Compare Delitzsch on Hebr. viii. 6 and note N.

In this sense St. Paul has said that "**the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from law**" (*v.* 21), and that "**man is justified by faith apart from works of law**" (*v.* 28). To the Jew who knew no "law" but "the law" of Moses, and valued that as the method of attaining to righteousness, such statements must seem to abolish the whole principle of law, and make it void.

St. Paul in his usual manner anticipates the objection, by putting to himself the question which might be urged against him: "**Do we then make law of none effect through faith?**" *i.e.* through "**the** *faith*" which we have mentioned above as the sole condition of justification.

For the sense of καταργοῦμεν, see iii. 3; iv. 14. St. Paul did undoubtedly make of none effect the Jewish idea of "*the law,*" as the means of attaining to righteousness, and as necessary for the Gentile (compare Gal. ii. 16–19); but he shrinks from the thought (μὴ γένοιτο, see iii. 4, 6) of making "**law**" in its true character of none effect.

*Yea, we establish the law*] "**Nay,** *we establish* **law;**" we set it up, and make it stand firm by putting it upon its proper base. Viewed as a revelation of the eternal principles of morality, or in other words, of the holy will of God, "law," so far from being made void, is for the first time fully vindicated, and established by the Gospel of "righteousness by faith."

Digitized by Google

The two sides, negative and positive, of the Apostle's answer are developed in his subsequent argument. As to the former, he proceeds at once to show in c. iv., that law is not made void by its exclusion from justification, for this had always been so; it had no place in Abraham's justification by faith.

The positive side, the establishment and vindication of law in its true character, is discussed at large in c. vii.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 9, 25.

**9.** I. Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προῃτιασάμεθα γάρ. This is the received text, supported by a great preponderance of the best authorities, and accepted by all modern critics. Its interpretation depends upon the meaning of προεχόμεθα.

(a) προεχόμεθα, Passive.

This explanation is given by a Scholiast (possibly Photius) in Œcumenius. The assertion of the great advantage of the Jew, leads the Gentile to exclaim, "What then? Are we forestalled, and surpassed? ἡμεῖς προελήφθημεν, προεχόμεθα; To which St. Paul replies, "No, in no wise. If they have not done right, they are responsible just as you are, if you have not done right. But if both do right, the salvation is equal, so that you are not surpassed (προέχεσθε).

This sense of προέχεσθαι is found in Plutarch. But the decisive objection to this, and all other explanations which ascribe the question to a Gentile, is that there is nothing in the context to justify the transition to a Gentile speaker. (Fritzsche, Meyer.)

(b) προεχόμεθα, Middle.

(1) "Do we (I, Paul, and other Jews) put forward anything as a defence or excuse?"

There is force in Philippi's objection that the Verb in this sense must have its object expressed—προεχόμεθά τι; Herodot. II. 42, προέχεσθαί τε τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποταμόντα τοῦ κριοῦ, is no exception: but Meyer disregards this objection, and with Fritzsche, Ewald, Th. Schott, Morison, adopts the explanation, which agrees well with the context, and preserves the usual meaning ot προέχεσθαι.

(2) "Do we put ourselves forward?" *i.e.*, as better than those over whom God's judgment impends (Hofmann), or, as better than the Gentiles.

Objection. No example has been found of προέχεσθαι in this sense.

(3) "Are we better than they?"

This is the interpretation adopted in the English Versions from Wiclif to A. V., and is the simplest and best. It is supported by the Vulgate: "Quid ergo? Præcellimus eos? and by Euthymius (about A.D. 1100), quoted by Reiche in his 'Critical Comment.:'—'Αρα περισσὸν ἔχομεν παρὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας; In this case the Middle Voice has its subjective force: "Are we in our own opinion better? Do we think ourselves better?"

II. Τί οὖν προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως.

The received text, with this punctuation throwing the two questions into one, is thus explained in Œcumenius: "What advantage, then, have we (Jews), and what did we gain by being preferred before the uncircumcised?" But in this case the answer must have been in a different form, answering to τί; *e. g.* οὐδέν not οὐ πάντως.

III. Τί οὖν προκατέχομεν περισσόν; προῃτιασάμεθα, κ.τ.λ.

This reading, in which οὐ πάντως is wholly omitted, is capable of two interpretations:

(i.) "What advantage, then, do we (Jews) retain?"

So the Syriac (Schaaf), "Quid ergo obtinemus excellentiæ?" evidently referring to *v.* 1: "What advantage, then, hath the Jew?" and agreeing in the general sense with I. b. 3.

(ii.) "What advantage do we (Christians) hold?"

This explanation is adopted apparently by Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret: by Theodorus in Cramer's Catena ("After the reproof of our kinsmen, *i.e.* the Jews, we will speak of the greatness of our advantages,") and still more explicitly by Severianus [or Severus of Antioch (*Reiche*)], in Œcumenius and in Cramer's Cat. τί ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς χάριτος περισσὸν καὶ ἐξαιρετόν; τὴν πίστιν τὴν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δικαιοσύνης οὖσαν ἀπεργαστικήν.

But the reading, though found in D G can only be regarded as an ancient gloss, adopted into the text on account of the ambiguity and difficulty of the received reading.

**25.** "*A propitiation:*" not the Abstract Noun ἱλασμός (1 John ii. 2; iv. 10), but ἱλαστήριον, "propitiatory," originally a neuter adjective, but constantly used in Biblical Greek as a substantive in the definite concrete sense "place or instrument of propitiation;" compare ἀκροατήριον, δικαστήριον, θυμιατήριον, θυσιαστήριον. Once in N. T. (Heb. ix. 5), and about twenty-five times in LXX, it means the lid of gold above the Ark, called כַּפֹּרֶת "mercy-seat," or "propitiatory." It first occurs in Ex. xxv. 17, καὶ ποιήσεις ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσίου καθαροῦ, "and thou shalt make a propitiatory, a lid of pure gold," the

Digitized by Google

construction being the same as in Ex. xxvi. 1, 7. This apposition of ἱλαστήριον and ἐπίθεμα is the more natural, because on this first occurrence of כַּפֹּרֶת the translators might wish to show that they had both meanings under their consideration.

In Ezek. xliii. 14, 17, 20, τὸ ἱλαστήριον is used by the LXX for the ledge or raised base of the altar, "*the settle*" (A. V.), which like the capporeth was to be sprinkled with the blood; and in Amos ix. 1, for כַּפְתּוֹר, "the lintel," mistaken apparently for כַּפֹּרֶת. Philo ('Vita Mos.,' Lib. III. c. viii., ἐπίθεμα τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἱλαστήριον) recognises ἱλαστήριον as the technical and constant name of the lid of the Ark.

Upon this Biblical usage is founded the ancient interpretation.

*Origen* says that the Apostle here "refers the propitiatory described in Exodus to none but the Lord our Saviour." So on the Gospel of St. John, tom. 1, c. 38, he says that "the golden propitiatory resting on the two Cherubim in the Holy of Holies was a sort of shadow of this propitiatory." He also quotes Lev. iv. 16, καὶ εἰσοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ μόσχου κ.τ.λ.

*Chrysostom* (who is misunderstood by Meyer) gives the same interpretation. After showing that "*his own blood*" stands in contrast to the legal sacrifices, he explains ἀπολύτρωσις, and then goes on: "And for this very reason he calls Him ἱλαστήριον, showing that if the type had so much power, much more will the reality exhibit the same."

*Theodoret*. See the striking passage quoted in the footnote on the words "*through faith in his blood*."

*Cyril*, in Cramer's Catena: "For He has been set as a propitiatory through faith in His blood; for since He has made His own blood an exchange for the life of all, He has saved the world, and made the God and Father in heaven propitious and favourable to us."

*Theophylact*, and Gennadius in Œcumenius, give the same interpretation.

The *Syriac* has the same word here, and in Ex. xxv. 17, a word, however, which it uses also in the sense of "atonement."

The *Latin* varies between "propitiatorium," "propitiatorem," and "propitiationem."

*Luther* gives "Gnaden-Stuhl," and *Tyndale*, "a seate of mercy."

This interpretation has been supported with abundant learning, by a host of commentators.

The following objections are urged against it by Meyer and others.

(1) The Article would be required.

This is a mistake, τὸ ἱλαστήριον would designate (as in Heb. ix. 5) *the well-known propitiatory* itself, rather than an antitype or realized idea of it, now mentioned for the first time.

(2) This name in its application to Christ would come in here quite *abruptly*, without anything in the context to prepare for it.

If this objection were valid against the most familiar sense of ἱλαστήριον, it would apply with still greater force to all the other less usual meanings which have been ascribed to the word.

But in fact the mention of "*redemption*," in *v.* 24, has introduced the general idea of atonement, and the reference in *v.* 21 to the testimony of the law, prepares the way for an allusion to its typical atonements, of which the very centre and core was "the mercy seat;" by it the law gave its most solemn and significant testimony to that righteousness of God which was not yet made manifest. See Hebr. ix. 1–10.

(3) The objection that προέθετο, "*set forth*," would be inappropriate because the Ark of the Covenant, in the Holy of Holies, was hidden from the people, is not merely refuted by Heb. ix. 8–10, but the public setting forth of the Antitype becomes, in the light of that passage, an argument in favour of an allusion to the hidden Type.

(4) "If Christ were really thought of as Capporeth, the following εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ would be inappropriate, since the capporeth must have appeared rather as the ἔνδειξις of the Divine *grace*. Compare Heb. iv. 16."

This objection has no other foundation than the narrow and erroneous interpretation of "the righteousness of God," as if it were limited in this passage to "the judicial, more precisely the *punitive justice*, which must find its holy satisfaction, and received that satisfaction in the propitiatory offering of Christ." (Meyer.) But "the righteousness of God," rightly understood, is in fact one with His mercy.

(5) The conception of Christ as the antitype of the mercy seat, is found nowhere else in the whole N. T.

This is true; but it does not therefore follow that this conception is foreign to the Apostle's mode of viewing the atoning work of Christ. There are other examples of O. T. ideas and figures applied once and once only to Christ, as "*the Rock*" (1 Cor. x. 4), "*the Serpent*" (John iii. 14); and conversely we find a N. T. idea applied *once* only to O. T. history in 1 Cor. x. 2, "*baptized unto Moses.*" (Compare the Additional Note on ix. 5, Obj$^{n}$. (1).

II. There is no proof that the word was



Digitized by Google

ever used by any writer *as a Substantive*, for "a propitiatory offering," or "a propitiation," or in any other than the well-established Biblical sense. The passages alleged in favour of "a propitiatory sacrifice," prove only that the Adjective was joined with such Substantives as θάνατος, μνῆμα, ἀνάθημα: see 4 Macc. xvii. 22; Joseph. Antiq. xvi. c. 7; Dio Chrys. Orat. xi. 1.

The analogy of τὸ σωτήριον (more frequently, ἡ θυσία τοῦ σωτηρίου), "*the peace-offering*," is in favour of the sense supported by Biblical usage, not of that for which no usage can be found.

Moreover, if ἱλαστήριον meant a sacrifice, the emphatic αὐτοῦ (**"in his own blood"**) would be unmeaning; it is needless to say that a sacrifice is propitiatory in its *own* blood. See footnote on the words "*through faith in his blood.*"

III. The abstract idea of "propitiation" is inappropriate after προέθετο, which points to a definite public appearance. (Meyer.)

IV. "Propitiator," found in some Latin Codd. (Origen), is adopted by Aquinas, Melanchthon, Estius, Van Hengel, and rendered by Wiclif "forgiver," by Cranmer, "obtainer of mercy."

V. Morison takes the word as simply an Adjective, "propitiatory," in which case also it must be masculine.

This view, therefore, as well as IV., is open to Meyer's objection, that there is no example of ἱλαστήριος used with reference to persons.

If it be urged that the simple adjective is the more comprehensive rendering, embracing all that is essential in the rest, and designating Christ as the antitype of *all* symbols of propitiation (Schaaf on Morison), we must still maintain that there is a special and predominant allusion to the mercy seat, not to the sacrifice.

On the whole we conclude that the rendering **"a propitiatory,"** meaning "a mercy seat," is required by the following considerations: (1) the absence of any other adequate explanation of the emphatic position of αὐτου in ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι: see note on those words: (2) the well-known Biblical sense of ἱλαστήριον: (3) the consent of the Greek Fathers, including Chrysostom; (4) the propriety of the idea "in accordance with which Christ the bearer of the Divine glory and grace, sprinkled with His own sacrificial blood, would be regarded as the antitype of the Kapporeth." (Meyer.)

The force of this last argument is much enhanced when we remember the twofold significance of "the propitiatory."

(1) It was the central point of the Divine Presence and Manifestation, the place of meeting and communion, between God and the representative of His people; Ex. xxv. 22; Lev. xvi. 2. So in Christ the full manifestation of God to man is made, and on Him rests "the glory of the Lord," the true Shekinah, now revealed by the rending of the vail.

(2) Among all instruments and symbols of atonement, this alone was called "the propitiatory" as being the most eminent. As on it was made a general atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year (Lev. xvi. 11–14, 15, 30); so in Christ Jehovah expiates and takes away the sins of the world, thereby declaring Himself the Holy One, who will have His people also to be holy (compare Bähr, 'Symbolik des Mos. Cultus,' I. 387 ff. and Kurtz, 'Sacrificial Worship of the O. T.' p. 42).

---

# CHAPTER IV.

1 *Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness,* 10 *before he was circumcised.* 13 *By faith only he and his seed received the promise.* 16 *Abraham is the father of all that believe.* 24 *Our faith also shall be imputed to us for righteousness.*

WHAT shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?

---

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH INDEPENDENT OF WORKS, OF CIRCUMCISION, AND OF THE LAW.

In iii. 27–31, St. Paul has rapidly strung together some of the consequences that follow from the great doctrine set forth in *vv.* 21–26, especially those consequences which directly affect the position of Jew and Gentile under the new law of faith. These summary statements of the closing verses of c. iii., are taken up again and fully discussed in subsequent parts of the Epistle.

The first point is the exclusion of the glorying of the Jew (iii. 27, 28), and the second, closely connected with it, is the equality in God's sight of Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision (*vv.* 29, 30). These two points in like order and connexion form the subject of c. iv.

Digitized by Google

GENERAL LIBRARY University of MICHIGAN

2 For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath *whereof* to glory; but not before God.

3 For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.

---

1–8. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH WITHOUT WORKS FORESHOWN IN THE EXAMPLE OF ABRAHAM, AND IN THE WORDS OF DAVID.

1. *What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?*] The phrase "**What then shall we say,**" &c. introduces an inference from the preceding passage (iii. 27–31), not from its last words especially: compare vi. 1; vii. 7; viii. 31; ix. 14, 30 (Van Hengel). If glorying is excluded, and there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile, what then shall we say of the case of Abraham?

The record of Abraham's faith in Gen. xv. 6, supplies an instance of righteousness "**apart from law**" and yet "*witnessed by the Law*" (iii. 21). In reasoning with Jews concerning the "righteousness of faith," St. Paul could not possibly pass over the example of Abraham's justification (Gen. xv. 6), which was a standard theme of discussion in the Jewish schools. Bp. Lightfoot ('Galatians,' p. 154), in an interesting Essay on "The faith of Abraham," quotes, among other striking passages collected by Gfrörer, one from the *Mechilta* on Ex. xiv. 31:—"Abraham our father inherited this world and the world to come solely by the merit of faith, whereby he believed in the Lord; for it is said, *And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.*"

On the opinion that St. James (ii. 14–26), refers to St. Paul's doctrine, or to some prevalent perversion of it, see the Introduction to St. James in this Commentary, and Theile, 'Comment. in Ep. Jacobi,' pp. 145–166.

*as pertaining to the flesh.*] **According to the flesh.** St. Paul puts the question as proceeding from a Jew, and Abraham is therefore called "*our father*," or, as in many authorities, "**our forefather.**" "He calls him a father according to the flesh, ejecting them (the Jews) from true kinship with him, and preparing the way for the kinship of the Gentiles" (Chrysostom): "For by faith and by promise we that believe are Abraham's children" (Photius).

Theodoret adopts the other reading—"What shall we say that Abraham our father hath found according to the flesh?" and thus interprets it: "What righteousness of Abraham's, wrought by works before he believed God, did we ever hear of?" For the righteousness that is in works, he calls "according to the flesh."

Bp. Bull, adopting this connexion, explains κατὰ σάρκα as meaning "by his natural powers without the grace of God:" so Grotius and Hammond. Pelagius, Estius, and others have referred it to circumcision, as received by Abraham first: but circumcision is not treated of until *v.* 9.

The preponderance of authority is in favour of that order of the Greek words which compels us to adopt the connexion: "**What then shall we say that Abraham our forefather according to the flesh hath found?**"

The general question "**What then is the advantage of the Jew?**" (iii. 1) is thus made to depend for decision on the case of the great Patriarch, from whom all blessing and privilege was derived: "What advantage has he gained for himself and for us his descendants?"

On the reading see note at end of chapter.

2. This argument (as well as the question in *v.* 1, which it is meant to support,) is put from the Jewish point of view, as an objection to the statements in iii. 27–30, which seem to deny all advantage to the Jew, and to be inconsistent with the received tenet that Abraham was justified by works (1 Macc. ii. 51, 52; Sirach xliv. 20; Ja. ii. 20).

"Glorying, you say, is excluded. What then shall we say of Abraham? For if, as we Jews hold, Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory."

In the latter part of the verse—Ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν—St. Paul from his own point of view more closely defines the ambiguous term "glorying," and at the same time directly denies the conclusion: "*But* Abraham has *not* whereof to glory *before God.*" This denial of the conclusion, being proved from Scripture, in *vv.* 3–5, shows that the antecedent supposition also is false, and that Abraham was not justified *before God* by works: a result which is further confirmed in *vv.* 6–8, by its accordance with the testimony of David.

The question of *v.* 1, "**What then shall we say that Abraham our forefather according to the flesh hath found?**" is thus in part answered: he has found, not any cause of glorying in his own merits, but "*the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.*"

The question, what has Abraham found, receives a further answer in the discussion concerning circumcision, which follows in *vv.* 9–12.



Digitized by Google

4 Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.

5 But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

6 Even as David also describeth

---

Among the advantages of this interpretation, are the following:

(1) It makes the Apostle's argument perfectly clear and simple.

(2) It does not depend on the particular sense assigned to κατὰ σάρκα, a phrase on which other interpretations put a strained dogmatic import, which finds no support in the context.

(3) It avoids the great faults of the Patristic interpretation, which assigns to "justified" and "glorying" meanings quite inconsistent with St. Paul's usage; see Bp. Bull, in Note at end of chapter.

3. Proof from Scripture that Abraham has not anything whereof to boast before God. The emphasis of the quotation lies on the word "*believed*," which is brought into the first place in the sentence, and "rendered almost antithetical by a trifling change of δέ for καί" (Winer): faith, not works, was counted unto Abraham for righteousness, because when old and childless he believed God's promise that his seed should be as the stars in multitude: see note on Gen. xv. 6. The import of the promise, and the nature of Abraham's faith are explained by St. Paul, in *vv.* 17–22.

*it was counted unto him.*] In *vv.* 3–11, the A.V. employs three different words "*count*," "*reckon*," "*impute*," to render the same Greek word λογίζομαι, and thus obscures the clearness and force of the argument.

"*Impute*" agrees closely with the Hebrew חָשַׁב, which in Kal means not "to number," but "to think, regard, or consider." Compare Gen. xxxviii. 15; 1 Sam. i. 13 ("*and Eli took her for a drunken woman*"); 2 Sam. xix. 19; Ps. xxxii. 2. But as "*impute*" has become a technical term in Theology, associated with a particular theory of Justification, it is better to use the word "*count*" throughout the passage.

*for righteousness.*] Abraham's faith was counted to him *as righteousness*, not merely *as leading to righteousness*; he was both regarded and treated as being righteous, and that because faith in God is in reality man's only true righteousness. See note on iii. 22.

4, 5. Explanation of the language used concerning Abraham in Gen. xv. 6, showing that it involves the principle of justification by faith without works.

*Now to him that worketh.*] In this illustration, taken from common life, the words have their ordinary meaning. Such interpretations as, "worketh righteousness" (Theodoret) "worketh that which is good" (Fritzsche), are out of place; and even Luther's "dealeth in works," belongs to the application rather than to the illustration itself. There is nothing to be supplied, but the Verb ἐργάζεσθαι is used absolutely of "working for hire," as in Acts xviii. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 12. This meaning, adopted by Origen, is put beyond doubt by the following words, "*his reward*" (ὁ μισθὸς), *i.e.* "**the hire**" corresponding to his work.

*is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.*] St. Paul assumes that the language of Gen. xv. 6 implies a *gratuitous* imputation, and on that assumption argues that Abraham's justification was not like the case of one who works for his reward, and has it counted to him as strictly due.

But where is this idea of *gratuitous* imputation to be found (1) in the word ἐλογίσθη itself; (2) in εἰς δικαιοσύνην: (3) or in ἐπίστευσεν?

Against (1) it is enough to observe that λογίζομαι is used indifferently of "setting to a man's account" what is or is not his due; *e.g.* the imputation of sin (*v.* 8) as well as of righteousness.

The true explanation lies in (2) and (3) combined, *i.e.* in the fact that *faith*, which was counted *for righteousness*, involves in its very essence the renunciation of all merit. It could therefore be counted for righteousness only by an act of God's free grace.

5. *But to him that worketh not.*] St. Paul here begins as if he meant to give an illustration parallel and opposite to that contained in *v.* 4: "to him that worketh not whatever is reckoned, must be reckoned not of debt but of grace." But in the clause "*but believeth*," &c., the general principle runs into the application, and is expressed in terms appropriate to the case of justification.

*but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly.*] The strong term τὸν ἀσεβῆ "the ungodly man," has been thought to refer to Abraham as having been formerly an idolater. (Döllinger, 'First Age of The Church,' i. 273, note.)

But the Singular, τὸν ἀσεβῆ, has the ordinary generic sense, describing not the individual Abraham, but the class to which Abraham and all who are justified by faith belong.

Digitized by Google

the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,

7 *Saying*, Blessed *are* they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

8 Blessed *is* the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.

---

The word ἀσεβής, which does not occur in the Gospels or the Acts, is frequent in the LXX, and is not limited to its strict etymological sense, "*one who does not worship the true God*," but is also used in the general sense, "irreligious, ungodly, wicked," being quite as common as ἄδικος or ἄνομος, and far more common than ἁμαρτωλός.

The force of the word is admirably explained by Beveridge, Sermon xc., as describing "whatever is offensive to God's person, contrary to His nature, injurious to His name, or unbecoming His honour and majesty in the world."

See Suicer's Thesaurus, and Origen on *v.* 6 in Cramer.

The strong word is chosen, as in *v.* 6, to heighten the contrast between the unworthiness of man, and the mercy of God in justifying him. Compare the Epistle to Diognetus, c. ix. "For what else could cover our sins but His righteousness? In whom was it possible for us, the wicked and ungodly (τοὺς ἀνόμους καὶ ἀσεβεῖς), to be justified, except only in the Son of God?"

"With the growth in goodness grows the sense of sin. One law fulfilled shows a thousand neglected. Moral advancement, as a natural consequence, destroys the sense of merit, and produces that of sin." (Moztley, 'Essays,' i. 326).

*his faith is counted for righteousness.*] We see here the nature of the faith that is counted for righteousness; it is the faith of one who regards *himself as "ungodly,"* and unable to justify himself by his own works, but on the other hand has full *trust in God's mercy* to justify him, unworthy as he is.

This is the quality of true faith on its human or subjective side. "The believer has nothing more to expect than what God bestows on the ungodly whom He justifies; and nothing more to offer to God than what the ungodly who longs to be justified has to bring with him, namely, faith." (Hofmann.)

**6–8.** The language of Scripture concerning Abraham's justification as above interpreted (*vv.* 3–5), corresponds with that of the 32nd Psalm, in which David also pronounces the blessing of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works. This then is not a second *example* from the O. T. of God's method of justification, but a statement confirming the Apostle's interpretation of the case of Abraham, which he resumes in *v.* 9.

*describeth the blessedness.*] "**telleth the blessing.**" The μακαρισμός (*v.* 9 and Gal. iv. 15) means not "*blessedness*," but "a declaring blessed," "a felicitation;" it is the proper word to apply to God, and to the most God-like among men, and to all that is highest, happiest, and best (see Aristotle, 'Nic Eth.,' I., xii. 4; 'Rhet.' I., ix. 34).

*imputeth righteousness.*] When God counts a man's faith to him for righteousness, this is more briefly expressed by saying that God counts righteousness to him, that He counts him righteous, or, in one word, justifies him. The doctrine of "imputed righteousness," founded partly upon this passage, assumes sometimes such strange forms that it will be useful to quote here the words of one of its most learned and moderate advocates. "Finding it distinctly stated not only that sinners are justified by *faith*, but that *righteousness without works is imputed to them, their faith being counted for righteousness*, I have not hesitated to state that believers are justified by *imputed*, not by *inherent*, righteousness. That this is Christ's righteousness in the sense that it is the fruit and purchase of His work in the flesh, cannot be doubted; but that it is His in the more strict and exact sense, in which, as the Archbishop (Tillotson) truly says, it appears in the statements of some supporters of the doctrine, I have nowhere asserted, but have been and am still content with the sober statement of Hooker, ('Discourse of Justification,' § 6.) "Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him" (Bp. O'Brien, 'Nature of Faith,' p. 352, note N).

*without works.*] As the blessedness of which David speaks rests solely on the fact that *sin* is forgiven, covered, not imputed, there is no room to think of *works* in such a case. This non-imputation of sin, St. Paul calls an imputation of righteousness (*v.* 6), and uses this negative aspect of justification as showing most clearly that it is altogether independent of works, and so confirming his argument concerning the justification of Abraham.

**7, 8.** *Saying, Blessed are they.*] The Greek, as well as the Hebrew, may be better rendered here, and in *v.* 8, as an exclamation: "**Happy they,**" &c., "**Happy the man,**" &c. For the general meaning of these verses, see notes on Ps. xxxii. 1, 2.

Digitized by Google

9 *Cometh* this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.

10 How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

11 And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had yet* being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe,

---

9–12. THE MEANING AND USE OF CIRCUMCISION.

**9, 10.** The question "What has Abraham, *our forefather*, found?" (*v.* 1), concerns Abraham's children as well as himself; and the partial answer, that he has found a blessing such as David his descendant describes, gives occasion for the further question whether this blessing is limited to those who are of the circumcision, as Abraham and David both were. Thus after having shown that Abraham's justification was by faith and not by works, St. Paul proceeds further to prove that it was not dependent on circumcision.

*Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also?*] **Is then this blessing upon the circumcision, or,** &c.

The word "*only*" is not in the Greek, and the sense is sufficiently clear without it.

The word "*then*" shows that the question arises out of the preceding argument, and is to be answered in accordance with it: this is further shown in the words that follow, "*for we say.*"

The reasoning will be made clearer by dropping the interrogative form. Abraham, we say, became partaker of the blessing when he was justified by faith: he was so justified while yet in uncircumcision: therefore we conclude that the blessing is not upon the circumcision only, but upon the uncircumcision also. The conclusion, though drawn from the one case of Abraham, is assumed to be general, and rightly so, because that case is not merely an example or "fair specimen" of the rest, but the origin and cause of all, as is more fully shown in *v.* 11. Thus the nature and conditions of circumcision in all cases depend upon its nature and condition in the case of Abraham, and the argument is one from cause to effect. The repeated interrogations and dilemmas of *vv.* 9, 10, add much to the rhetorical force and grace of the passage, but the cogency of the reasoning is not dependent on them.

**11.** This verse is closely connected with the preceding, and completes the description of the relation between Abraham's justification and his circumcision, which took place about fourteen years afterwards.

*the sign of circumcision.*] In instituting circumcision (Gen. xvii. 11), God says "*It shall be for a token* (LXX, σημεῖον) *of the covenant betwixt Me and you.*" Former covenants had in like manner been confirmed by visible signs, the rainbow (Gen. ix. 12, 13, 17) and the burning lamp (Gen. xv. 17, 18).

*a seal of the righteousness of the faith, &c.*] In *v.* 17, St. Paul expressly quotes the chief promise of the covenant of circumcision, "*I have made thee a father of many nations,*" and in *v.* 18 declares it to be "*according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be,*" *i.e.*, according to the very promise concerning which it had been said, "*Abraham believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness*" (Gen. xv. 5, 6). In other words, the new covenant, repeating and enlarging the promise which Abraham had believed, was an assurance to him that his faith had been approved; and "*the sign of circumcision,*" which "*he received*" with it, and which the Rabbis called "the Seal of Abraham," was "*a seal of the righteousness*" imputed to him because "*of the faith which he had being yet uncircumcised:*" compare *v.* 12. This metaphorical sense of the word "Seal," meaning any strong external confirmation (1 Cor. ix. 2), arises out of the use of a seal to authenticate and confirm a written covenant.

*yet being uncircumcised*] Literally **in his uncircumcision.**

*that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised.*] Literally "**while in uncircumcision.**" Both the construction and the sense of the passage are illustrated by an early quotation of it in the Epistle of Barnabas, c. xiii.: "Behold, I have made thee father of the nations who believe in the Lord without having been circumcised (δι' ἀκροβυστίας)." For this use of διά compare ii. 27; xiv. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 4.

The blessing promised to Abraham included from the first "all families of the earth" (Gen. xii. 2, 3), and the same universality is seen in each renewed promise, that his seed shall be as the dust of the earth (Gen. xiii. 16), and as the stars of heaven (xv.

Digitized by Google

though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:

12 And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the

---

5). Abraham's faith in the promise was seen in his conduct on each occasion, and on the last it was expressly recorded and "*counted to him for righteousness.*" He was thus accepted as righteous through faith, not only for himself, but as the father of the promised seed, that they also might be justified through faith: and so far as his fatherhood conveys the Divine blessing, it is a fatherhood according to promise, and according to faith, not according to the flesh: compare Gal. iii. 7.

This is made yet clearer by what follows in Gen. xvi.: Abraham, already pronounced righteous, and selected to be the father of the promised seed, seeks to obtain it "according to the flesh;" but Ishmael, so begotten, is not the heir of the blessing, not being the child of faith, nor of promise.

Then in Gen. xvii., thirteen years afterwards comes the solemn renewal of the covenant, prefaced by the condition "*Walk before me, and be thou perfect,*" inaugurated by the new names El-shaddai, Abraham, Sarah (see notes on Gen. xvii.), and finally sealed by the sign of circumcision.

In the renewed promises the universality of the blessing, and its religious or spiritual character are strongly marked: *vv.* 4, 5, "*thou shalt be a father of many nations*, lit. "**of a multitude of Goyim:**" *v.* 6, "*I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee:*" *v.* 7, "*I will establish my covenant .. .. for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.*"

In striking contrast to this universal participation in the blessing is the limitation of the ordinance of circumcision, which is not extended beyond the family of Abraham (see Michaelis in note on Gen. xvii. 13). It thus marked and sealed the *human source* of the promised blessing, namely Abraham's "*body now dead,*" and the *human channel*, namely Abraham's bodily descendants.

The Jews overlooked the all-important distinction between the universal inheritance of the blessing, and the particular instrument chosen for its actual realisation: they did not understand that it was to be realised *through* them but *for* all,—through one channel chosen, set apart, and *sealed* by circumcision, but *for* all who should be fitted in the same way as Abraham was to receive the blessing, *i.e.*, for all who like him should believe God's promise of salvation, and walk before Him in uprightness.

Thus by circumcision Abraham was marked out as the divinely appointed father of the promised seed in every sense; (1) of the seed in whom all nations should be blessed, *i.e.* Christ: (2) of the seed that should be the human channel of the blessing, *i.e.*, the Jews, and; (3) of the seed that should be as the stars of heaven, the multitude of nations that should be counted as Abraham's children, being heirs of the same blessing through the like faith, *i.e.* "*of all them that believe.*"

St. Paul here treats of the fatherhood of Abraham in the two latter senses, *i.e.*, in reference to Gentiles and Jews. Circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of faith in the uncircumcised, was not given for his sake alone, but that by transmitting the assurance of the like blessing to others "**he might be father of all them that believe, while in uncircumcision, in order that righteousness may be imputed to them.**"

With this connexion the parallel clauses, "*father of all them that believe,*" and "*father of circumcision,*" have their due prominence, which is rather obscured, if the clause "**in order that righteousness,**" **&c.**, is made parallel instead of subordinate to "**that he might be father,**" **&c.**

**12.** *And the father of circumcision.*] The second purpose for which Abraham had "*received the sign of circumcision*" was, that he might transmit it, with its assurance of blessing, to his seed after him; in other words, "**that he might be father of circumcision.**" But to whom? To those who received it as he received it, namely, "*as a seal of the righteousness of faith;*" to those, therefore, who have not only the outward sign in the flesh, but also the inward quality of which it is the seal, *i. e.* in St. Paul's own words, "*to them who are not* **of circumcision** *only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had,* **while in uncircumcision.**" This verse evidently refers to Jews only, but St. Paul, or rather his amanuensis Tertius, who wrote this epistle, or one of its earliest transcribers, has inserted a superfluous Article —ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν, the effect of which would be to extend to *all* that walk in the steps of Abraham's faith, a statement which applies only to those who inherit from him the rite of circumcision. There is no trace of a various reading, and no ingenuity can explain the Article, without introducing a confusion of thought wholly foreign to St. Paul. It is in fact a strong testimony to the usual precision of his reasoning and language, that so many elaborate discussions have been raised over a mere slip of the pen, or clerical error.

Digitized by Google

steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which *he had* being *yet* uncircumcised.

13 For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

14 For if they which are of the law *be* heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect:

---

*being yet uncircumcised.*] Literally, **while in uncircumcision.** Why does St. Paul so emphatically repeat, what might here seem unnecessary, that Abraham's faith was a faith which he had while yet in uncircumcision? Because the very point of his argument is this, that in the example of Abraham we see the justification, not of a circumcised, but of an uncircumcised believer. "It is not for believing Gentiles to enter by the gate of the Jews, but for the Jews to enter by the gate of the Gentiles" (Godet). Compare note on *v.* 16

13–17. THE PROMISE INDEPENDENT OF LAW.

**13.** It has been shewn that Abraham's justification, and that of his children, with the blessings resulting from it, were dependent, not on circumcision, but only on faith (*vv.* 11, 12). This is now confirmed, and extended by shewing that the promise was equally independent of the law.

**13.** *For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law.*] **For not through law is the promise to Abraham or to his seed.** The argument closely resembles, but is not identical with, that in Gal. iii. 18. There "**law**" (without the Article) is represented as a principle directly opposed to "*promise*," so that "*the inheritance*" cannot be dependent on law, because God has granted it to Abraham by promise.

Here "**law**" and "**righteousness of faith**" (both without the article) are the principles opposed to and excluding each other; and what St. Paul asserts in *v.* 13, and proves in the following verses, is that "*the promise*" of the inheritance was to be realised and appropriated "*not through* **law** (14, 15) *but through* **righteousness** *of faith*" (16, 17).

*that he should be the heir of the world.*] What is "*the promise*" meant? For there is none in Genesis expressed in these words. Many commentators, with Meyer, refer it to the promise of the land of Canaan, interpreted as a type of the universal dominion of the Messianic theocracy, invested by the Prophets with a halo of glory, adopted in allegoric form by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 5; xix. 28), and shared by St. Paul (viii. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 2). The context forbids this interpretation, having no reference to the promise of the land of Canaan, but to "the seed" in whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed. The subject of the whole chapter is Abraham's justification by faith in the promise (Gen. xv. 5, 6): "*so shall thy seed be.*" To that passage St. Paul recurs, again and again (see *vv.* 3–5, 9–12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20–22). It is inconceivable that in this *v.* 13, "*the promise . . . . through the righteousness of faith,*" should mean not the promise which Abraham believed, and for believing was accounted righteous, but another subordinate promise, to which the context makes no allusion. St. Paul does allude several times in this chapter (*vv.* 17, 18) to another passage of Genesis (xvii. 5), in order to show the relation of faith to circumcision; and he regards that passage, not as containing a different promise, but as ratifying and defining the same promise of the seed (see especially *v.* 18). That one promise, rightly understood, included all the rest; for, "*in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed:*" this was "*the blessing of Abraham*" (Gal. iii. 14), which was to come upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus, and this, because it included all other blessings, was the inheritance of the world, the same inheritance of which St. Paul has spoken in Gal. iii. 18, 29: compare 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23; Heb. i. 2. "The promise will be literally fulfilled when the kingdoms of the world are given to the people of the Most High, and Christ will rule with His saints for ever and ever (Dan. vii. 27, &c.)." (Schaff.)

*but through the righteousness of faith.*] The righteousness of faith is not the procuring cause which moved God to grant the promise (as Meyer strangely asserts), but the conditional cause by which the promise was to be appropriated, and its fulfilment secured. "*Faith*" had been called forth from the first announcement of the promise (Gen. xii. 1–3), but the expression "*righteousness of faith,*" points to the renewal of the promise in Gen. xv. 5, 6.

**14, 15.** Proof that the promise is not to be realised through law.

**14.** *For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void.*] For the phrase

Digitized by Google

15 Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, *there is* no transgression.

16 Therefore *it is* of faith, that *it might be* by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all,

---

οἱ ἐκ νόμου, "**they which are of law,**" see notes on ii. 8, and iii. 26. The argument rests on the assumption that "*law*" and "*faith*" are opposite principles which exclude each other; for, as Chrysostom says, "he that clings to the law as saving him, dishonours the power of faith." If, then, they which depend on law, and not on faith, are heirs of the promised blessing, then faith—ἡ πίστις, *the* faith of which we have been talking—"*is* (**hath been**) *made void,*" it has had no room to operate, and no influence on the result, but *has been emptied* of its supposed power.

*and the promise made of none effect.*] Compare Gal. iii. 17, εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.

**15.** *Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression.*] Read, **For** *the law worketh wrath,* **but** *where no law is, there is no transgression.* The assertion made in Gal. iii. 18, that "*If the inheritance be of* (the) *law, it is no more of promise,*" is here more fully explained from the nature and effect of law. By making known the existence of sin, and exhibiting it in the form of actual transgression, the law brings man under God's wrath and condemnation, so producing an effect the very opposite of that which is intended by the promise (see iii. 20, and Gal. iii. 10, 11).

With the second γάρ retained, as in the A.V. the proof that "*the law worketh wrath*" is compressed into one brief but striking sentence: "*For where no law is, there is no transgression.*" To complete the proof, we must add, "and where there is no transgression, there is no wrath;" and then, farther, assume that the negative propositions involve the truth of their positive counterparts: "Where law is, there is transgression; and where transgression is, there is wrath." For a full exposition of the relation between law and sin, see vii. 7 ff.; and for the distinction between sin and transgression, which is sin against a known law, see v. 13, 14.

But with the various reading δέ (ℵ, A, B, C, &c.), now generally received instead of γάρ, the construction is much simpler. Instead of an incomplete proof that "*the law worketh wrath,*" we have the truth that "*the promise is not of law,*" proved, both positively and negatively, from the effects produced where there is, and where there is not, law; the negative statement serves at the same time to explain and confirm the positive, by showing how law worketh wrath, *i. e.* through transgression.

The article is prefixed to νόμος in the beginning of the verse, because it has been mentioned just before in *v.* 14. It is dropped again in the clause "*where no law is,*" which is perfectly general, referring to all law, and not only to "the law."

**16,17.** *Therefore it is of faith.*] The question discussed by St. Paul is the simple alternative whether the promise is of law or of faith (*v.* 13): having proved in *vv.* 14, 15 that it cannot be of law, he at once concludes, "**For this cause** *it is of faith*": compare Gal. iii. 12.

*that it might be by grace.*] This is the Divine purpose underlying the fact that "*it is of faith.*" Promise, faith, and grace stand together on one side: law, works, and merit on the other. Compare *vv.* 4, 5 and Gal. iii. 18, "*For if the inheritance be of* (the) *law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it* (κεχάρισται, "hath granted it of grace") *to Abraham by promise.*"

St. Paul's rapid sentences—"For this cause of faith, that by way of grace"—may be completed either by supplying from *v.* 13 "*the promise* **is**," or from *v.* 14, "the inheritance is" (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva). This reference to *v.* 14 is more probable because of the significant contrast ἐκ νόμου, ἐκ πίστεως (*vv.* 14, 16).

*to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed.*] Here, as in *v.* 11, St. Paul sees one purpose underlying another in the deep counsels of God: the inheritance is "of faith" in order that it may be given by way of grace, and of grace that it may be secured to all. "He here states a double boon, that the gifts are '*sure,*' and that they are sure '*to all the seed*'" (Chrysostom).

*not to that only which is of the law.*] If the promise could have been secured by the law to *any seed*, it must have been "*to that only which is of the law,*" *i. e.*, to Jews who live under the law of Moses. But in fact the promise if dependent on law could not be sure to any, since none could earn it by keeping the law: thus even to Jews it can be sure only as of grace and therefore of faith · and

Digitized by Google

Gen. 17. 17 (As it is written, [a]I have made thee a father of many nations,)[1] before him whom he believed, *even* God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.

‖ Or, *like unto him.*

18 Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, [b]So shall thy seed be.

[b] Gen. 15. 5.

19 And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb:

---

again we may say: The Jew must enter by the same gate as the Gentile. See note on last clause of *v.* 12. The same condition, then, which alone makes the promise sure even to those children of Abraham who are of the law, namely the condition of faith, makes it "*sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham.*"

It is self-evident that in this connexion "*all the seed*" means "all the believing seed," and "*that which is of the law*" means only the believing Jews: compare *v.* 12, and Gal. iii. 7–9.

*who is the father of us all.*] The spiritual fatherhood of Abraham already asserted in *vv.* 11, 12 is now proved by the solemn sanction of a Divine utterance: "*for a father of many nations have I made thee*" (Gen. xvii. 5, taken exactly from the LXX). The parenthesis only repeats the previous statement in the words of Scripture, and so does not obscure the connexion: "*Who is the father of us all . . . . before him whom he believed, even God.*"

The Present Tense carries us back to the scene of Gen. xv. where Abraham, standing before God (κατέναντι, compare Ex. xxxii. 11) whose promise he has believed, is already in His sight the father of a seed countless as the stars: for God's purpose knows no hindrance; though Abraham is as one dead in regard to the natural power of begetting children, God is he "**that giveth life to the dead**" (compare Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6): and though Abraham has as yet no seed, God is he that "**calleth the things that be not as things that be.**" This phrase does not exactly mean "calls into being," nor "names as being," but "calls to, summons, commands the things that be not as being," *i. e.*, as if they were as much present and obedient to His word as things that be: a conception of almighty power more sublime, if possible, than the creative fiat, "Let there be light," or the Psalmist's thought "He telleth the number of the stars: he calleth them all by their names."

The glorious attributes thus implied in God's promise, were realised in Abraham's faith, and formed its strong foundation.

18–22. The Strength of Abraham's Faith.

**18.** *Who against hope believed in hope.*] "*Who against hope* **in hope believed.**" This striking oxymoron, or combination of opposite qualities, is well explained by the older commentators: "past hope of man, in hope of God" (Chrysostom): "past hope according to nature, but in hope of the promise of God" (Theodoret): "past hope of his own nature, in hope of the power of Him that promised" (Severianus). Meyer's analysis of Abraham's faith as "*opposed to hope* in its *objective* reference, and yet *based on hope* in its *subjective* reference," shuts out the actual *objective* reference to God's power.

*that he might become the father of many nations.*] "**To the end that,**" &c., as in *v.* 16. This was not only the divinely appointed end of Abraham's faith, but also what Abraham himself looked to as the end of his faith. He believed with the full intention of becoming, what God promised, "*the father of many nations.*"

**19–21.** *And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead.*] This passage, according to the Received Text, refers to the narrative in Gen. xv. 1–6. On that occasion Abram took no heed at all to the difficulties attending the promise; he did not fix his mind upon the fact that his own body was already deadened, he being about a hundred years old, and upon the deadness of Sarah's womb: but at once, as the immediate sequence in the narrative implies, he embraced and believed the promise. This view of the passage as referring to Gen. xv. 1–6 seems at first sight to be confirmed by *v.* 22: but see note there.

Modern critics, supported by strong evidence of MSS, Versions, and Fathers, omit the negative in οὐ κατενόησεν, and refer the passage to Gen. xvii. 17 ff., from which some of its language is plainly borrowed. With this reading *v.* 19 must be closely connected with *v.* 20, the sense being that Abraham did notice the difficulties, but yet doubted not God's promise, *i. e.*, the new promise concerning Sarah in Gen. xvii. 16, 21. Translate:

Digitized by Google

20 He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God;

21 And being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform.

22 And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.

23 Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him;

24 But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;

25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

---

"**And without growing weak in faith, he observed his own body deadened, being** *about a hundred years old*, **and** *the deadness of Sarah's womb;* **but at the promise of God he staggered not** *through unbelief, but* **waxed strong** *in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he* **hath** (A.V. *had*) *promised, he* **is** (A.V. *was*) *able also to perform.*" "*Staggered*," a strong and picturesque word substituted by Tyndale for Wiclif's more exact and simple "doubted" (xiv. 23; Matt. xxi. 21, &c.). The Geneva Version reads "disputed," an admissible sense (Acts xi. 2; Jude 9), but less suitable.

**20.** *giving glory to God.*] *I.e.*, by acknowledging His almighty power; this meaning is made clear by the explanation added in the following clause, "*and being fully persuaded*," &c. These two participial clauses describe the mental effects which attended the strengthening of Abraham's faith. But we may add that Abraham gave glory to God in act as well as in thought, by his prompt obedience (Gen. xvii. 22, 23).

**22.** *And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.*] "**Wherefore also** *it was imputed*," *&c.*

"**Wherefore**" refers to the preceding context, *vv.* 18–21, and means "because he thus held fast his faith and gave glory to God." St. Paul extends the declaration of Gen. xv. 6 to the later occasion (Gen. xvii.), when the triumph of Abraham's faith was even more conspicuous. In like manner the same passage is applied in 1 Macc. ii. 52 to the offering of Isaac: "*Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness?*" Compare Ja. ii. 23.

23–25. Abraham our Pattern.

The leading example of justification by faith having been fully discussed in regard to Abraham himself (*vv.* 3–22), St. Paul proceeds to apply its teaching to his readers.

**23.** *Now it was not written for his sake alone.*] Compare Philo 'On Abraham,' c. i.: "Men whose virtues are recorded, as on pillars, in the sacred scriptures, not only to the praise of the men themselves, but also for the sake of encouraging those who read their history and leading them on to emulate their conduct."

**24.** *But for us also.*] "**But for our sake also**," *i.e.*, not only for our instruction and exhortation, xv. 4 and 1 Cor. ix. 10, but to assure us that righteousness shall be imputed to us in like manner: for "What is written of Abraham is written of his children": Beresch. R. (Tholuck).

*to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe.*] Read "*to whom it shall be imputed*, **namely to us who believe.**" The last words define the class to which we must belong, if that which is recorded of Abraham is to be fulfilled also in us. The word μέλλει is not a mere equivalent for the future "it will be imputed," but (as in viii. 13) implies the certainty of a Divine appointment, "it is to be imputed," and that not in the future judgment, but as soon as we believe.

*that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*] "*that* **raised** *Jesus*," *&c.* The faith which is to be imputed to us for righteousness is thus defined by the specific character of God, in whom we trust: as Abraham believed a Divine promise, which only the life-giving and creative power of God could perform (*v.* 17), so Christians trust for redemption and justification to Him who has already raised Jesus from the dead for this very purpose.

**25.** The reason why faith in Him who raised up Jesus from the dead, is to be imputed to us for righteousness lies in the purpose of Christ's death and resurrection. The Apostle thus returns to the main point of his subject (iii. 24) "bringing in the Cross into the midst" (Chrys.).

*Who was delivered for our offences.*] *I.e.* "**delivered up**," to death, as in the leading passage, Is. liii. 12: ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, . . . . καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

Digitized by Google

The Passive Verbs indicate that Christ was given up to death, and raised again by the Father: compare viii. 32.

"*For our offences*," *i.e.*, to atone for them: "*for our justification*," to accomplish it, *i.e.* in order that we, like Abraham, might be justified through faith in God that quickeneth the dead; compare *v.* 17 with *v.* 24. The former clause, if it stood alone, might fairly be interpreted, "because of the offences which we have committed." But the more comprehensive sense, including the fact of offences committed, is that given by Theodoret: "On account of our offences He endured the Passion, in order that He might pay our debt." This also agrees better with the parallel clause, "rose again for our justification," in which the same Preposition (διά) is used.

Though the Atonement for sins was made by Christ's death, it was proved and manifested by His resurrection, and so presented as an object of faith. The resurrection, therefore, serves this purpose, that we may thereby be led to believe that Christ died for our sins, and by so believing may realise and appropriate the benefits of His death; in other words, that we may be justified.

More than this, the Resurrection is itself the source of Justification and life (v. 18; vi. 5, 6; Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13). "On the Cross, our Lord gave Himself for us; through the Resurrection, He giveth Himself to us. On the Cross, He was the Lamb which was slain for the sins of the world; in the Resurrection, that Body which was slain became Life-giving." (Pusey, 'Christ Risen our Justification,' a noble Sermon on this text.)

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. IV., *vv.* 1, 2, 25.

**1.** (1) Modern Editors read with a great preponderance and variety of authority,

εὑρηκέναι Ἀβ. τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα.

(2) Omit εὑρηκέναι B, 47*: Chrysostom does not comment on it.

(3) Place εὑρηκέναι immediately before κατὰ σάρκα: K L P, 47 mg. Syr., many Fathers.

(4) For the unusual word προπάτορα many MSS and Fathers read πατέρα.

Dr. Westcott (*Dict. of Bible*, ii. p. 530) regards εὑρηκέναι as possibly an interpolation: but it is supported by overwhelming authority, and the sense is so clear without it, that a copyist would be more likely to omit than to insert it. The wish to secure its connexion with κατὰ σάρκα accounts for the change of place.

**2.** The argument of this passage is fully discussed by Bishop Bull, 'Harmonia Apostolica, Dissertatio Posterior,' c. xii. 14–27, whose criticism may be abridged as follows.

A. Interpretation of *the Greek Fathers*—

Major: *If Abraham was justified by works, he has not anything to glory of before God* (since this sort of external righteousness, however glorious in the eyes of men, is of no value in the sight of God).

Minor: *But Abraham had whereof to glory before God* (*i.e.* he was approved by God Himself).

Conclusion: *Therefore Abraham was not justified by works.*

"The conclusion is in accordance with St. Paul's meaning, but the premisses do not agree with the text.

(*a*) If any one should say that *v.* 2 belongs wholly to the major premiss (*i.e.*, as the Greek Fathers above), he would verily make the Apostle's argument marvellously elliptical, as consisting of one proposition only, without either minor premiss or conclusion expressed.

(*b*) Moreover, St. Paul manifestly speaks of the same glorying which in iii. 27, he had declared to be excluded by the law of faith; and which, therefore, he could not attribute to Abraham, whom he everywhere maintains to be justified by that law of faith.

It is true that there is, as Grotius says, a just and proper sort of glorying, even before God (v. 2, 3, 11; 1 Cor. i. 31; 2 Cor. x. 17), but it is equally certain that in treating, as here, of the matter of justification, it is the Apostle's habit to exclude all glorying entirely.

(*c*) Further, according to this interpretation, the Apostle would contradict himself in terms: for he would be supposed to argue thus:

If Abraham was justified by works before God, then he deserved praise only of men, and received no praise nor reward from God. Is not this the same as if the Apostle had said, if Abraham was justified by works, he was not justified?

(*d*) If it be said, that "justified" here means "regarded as righteous by men," this is opposed to the whole context, in which it is too clear to need proof that the question discussed is concerning man's justification in the sight of God Himself.

Moreover in this way also, there will be a senseless tautology in the Apostle's words.

If by works Abraham was justified before men, then he was justified before men, not before God.

Digitized by Google

What can be more absurd than such reasoning?"

B. The interpretation of Bishop Bull himself, Fritzsche, and others is as follows:

What then shall we say that our forefather Abraham has gained according to the flesh, *i.e.*, by his own natural powers without the grace of God?

He has gained nothing in this way. For let us suppose the contrary, that he obtained justification according to the flesh, that is, by works done in his own strength.

*If Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast of before God*, namely the works by which he was justified. *But* the consequent is proved false by Holy Scripture (*vv.* 3–5), and he has *not* anything to boast of *before God*.

Therefore the antecedent must be false, and Abraham was not justified by works, and has gained nothing according to the flesh.

**25.** Dean Alford here attributes to St. Paul an "alliterative use of the same Preposition, where the meanings are clearly different," and remarks on *v.* 24, "Observe that διά in the two clauses has not exactly the same sense,—'on *his* account' being=(1) *to celebrate his faith*; and (2) on our account =*for our profit*: see on *v.* 25."

Godet also insists that διά has its only proper and natural sense in the first clause, "because of the offences which we have committed," and that the second clause must therefore be rendered, "because of our justification which was accomplished by his death." The same view of the passage was taken by Grotius, Bp. Horsley, and Dr. Burton in his note on Bp. Bull, 'Harmonia Apost.,' p. 12.

The whole difficulty arises from attributing different senses to διά. This radical error is carried to an extreme by Cornelius a Lapide, who gives no less than five senses to the Preposition in the last clause, saying that it signifies the material cause, the exemplary, the efficient, the meritorious, and the final cause.

The fact is, that διά with the Accusative ("through to") simply traces an effect to a cause, it marks the *existence* of a causal relation between them, without defining its *particular character*. Thus, in the common phrase διά τοῦτο, "for this cause," it is impossible, without referring to the context, to say whether the cause is *antecedent* (as in i. 26, v. 12, xiii. 6), or *final* (as in Philemon 15, τάχα γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὥραν ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς. Compare 1 Tim. i. 13). If in the former case we choose to render διὰ τοῦτο "because of this," and in the latter case "for this purpose," we must not imagine that διά itself has these different meanings: we are simply transferring to the Preposition a distinction which belongs to the context. Thus, in *v.* 25, the use of διά in both clauses does not determine whether the causal relation is or is not of the same kind in both cases—"Christ died for our offences" may mean either "because we had offended," or "to atone for our offences." "Christ was raised for our justification," *might* mean, so far as Grammar is concerned, "because our justification was already accomplished," but in accordance with the immediate context (*v.* 24), and with the usual dogmatic representation, it much more probably, we may almost say certainly, means that He was raised in order that we might be justified.

---

## CHAPTER V.

1 *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God,* 2 *and joy in our hope,* 8 *that sith we were reconciled by his blood, when we were enemies,* 10 *we shall much more be saved being reconciled.* 12 *As sin and death came by Adam,* 17 *so much more righteousness and life by Jesus Christ.* 20 *Where sin abounded, grace did superabound.*

THEREFORE being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:

---

CHAP. V.—1–11. BLESSEDNESS OF THE JUSTIFIED.

St. Paul has shown that neither Gentile nor Jew had attained to righteousness by works (i. 18–iii. 20); he has described "the righteousness of God," which is exhibited in Christ's atoning death, and bestowed by God's grace as a free gift without works, and therefore without distinction of persons, upon all who by faith accept it (iii. 21–30); and he has proved by the example of Abraham, and the testimony of David, that his doctrine of "righteousness by faith without works" is in harmony with Scripture (iii. 31–iv. 25). He now sets forth the blessedness of the justified, as consisting in present "*peace with God*," and joyful "*hope of the glory of God*," both resting on the death and life of Him, "*by whom we have now received the atonement*" (*vv.* 1–11).

**1.** *Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God.*] St. Paul speaks as one of

Digitized by Google

2 By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

---

those "*who believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead*" (iv. 24): thus there is a sound of confidence and triumph in his words, "**justified therefore** *by faith we have peace with God.*" He speaks of justification as a thing already received; for he has respect only or chiefly to that act of grace, whereby God at first absolves the believer from all guilt, and receives him into a state of favour. That state of favour is here called "peace with God." On the distinction between present and final justification see Waterland, 'On the Eucharist,' ix. 2, and Barrow, vol. ii., Sermon v., p. 64.

On the marginal rendering, "let us have peace with God," see Note at end of chapter.

"*Peace with God*" (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν) is not quite identical with "*the peace of God.*" The former is the peace that puts an end to war and enmity, the new *relation with God*, into which the justified believer is admitted: he is no longer an enemy lying under wrath, but a son reconciled, restored and beloved. Upon this new *relation between God and man* is founded the work of the Holy Spirit *in* man, which results finally in the perfect harmony of the inner life, the deep tranquillity of a soul that has found its true happiness and rest, in a word, "the peace of God."

**2.** *By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.*] **Through whom also we have had our introduction** *by faith into this grace wherein we stand.*

Though St. Paul has just before spoken of "*Jesus our Lord, who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification,*" he cannot describe the happy state into which we are thus brought, without again reminding us to whom our thanksgiving is due: "*we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

The difference of tense in the two verses, unnoticed in the Authorised Version, is important: it shows that "**the introduction into this grace**" is prior to "*peace with God,*" that it is not a second and further effect of justification, but justification itself. Thus the word "*also*" points to the identity of the giver: He *through* whom we *have* peace, is the same **through whom we have had the introduction** into this grace; "who brought us near when we were far off" (Chrysostom). The reference of all to Christ is further seen in the word inadequately rendered "*access*:" it describes not our act, but Christ's, not our coming, but His bringing us. The distinction is observed by Chrysostom in the parallel passage, Ephesians ii. 18, "*For through Him we both have* **our introduction** (A. V. *access*) *by one Spirit unto the Father.*" He said not "*access,*" but "**introduction,**" for not of ourselves did we come near, but by Him *were brought near.* There is the same thought similarly expressed in 1 Pet. iii. 18, "*Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.*"

The words "*by faith*" (attested by a preponderance of authorities) indicate the act on man's part, in which he lays hold of Christ's arm outstretched to bring him near to God.

"*This grace wherein we stand,*" is a description of the state of the justified implying present favour and acceptance with God, and His help to keep us therein. Compare 1 Cor xv. 1; 1 Pet. v. 12.

*and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.*] The word rendered "*rejoice*" is the same which has been already translated "*boast*" (ii. 17; iii. 27; iv. 2); it indicates not merely the inward joy of the heart, but the grateful and confident utterance of the lips. In contrast with all false boasting, the believer boasts in hope of the glory of God.

The clause itself is not dependent on either of those which precede it, but introduces a new and important element into the Apostle's description of the state of the justified: "*we have peace with God,*" "*and* **we** *rejoice in hope of the glory of God.*"

And what is "*the glory of God?*" It is an eternal mystery which the heart of man cannot yet conceive, but of which Holy Scripture gives us here and there short glimpses. Like the righteousness of God, the truth of God, and the life of God (Eph. iv. 18), it has its hidden source in the Father, it is manifested in the Son, it is reflected in man: "*The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them*" (John xvii. 22).

Of this "*glory of God*" man was, from the first, designed to partake (1 Cor. xi. 7), but by sin all men "*come short*" or **suffer loss** of it (iii. 23); its restoration is wrought by the Spirit revealing and imparting the glory of Christ: "*We all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord*" (2 Cor. iii. 18). In presenting this "*glory of God,*" as an object of the believer's *hope*, the Apostle points to its *future* perfection in the glorification of our whole nature, body, soul, and spirit.

The glory in which man will thus be transfigured will still be "*the glory of God,*" even as the sunshine resting upon earth is still the light of heaven; it will be an everlasting

Digitized by Google

3 And not only *so*, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience;

4 And patience, experience; and experience, hope:

5 And hope maketh not ashamed;

---

glory, just because man will dwell for ever in the light of God's countenance.

3. *And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also.*] No sooner has the Apostle pointed to "*the glory of God*," as a light shining afar to cheer the believer on his course, than he thinks of the contrast between that bright distance and the darkness that lies around him here.

To weaker faith earthly sorrows might seem to dim the heavenly light: but to him hope shines out brighter through the gloom. The sudden transition from "*glory*" to "*tribulations*," brings out the fulness of the believer's triumph. St. Paul can promise no exemption from sorrow, for he knows "*that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God*" (Acts xiv. 22). Therefore he speaks here of "**the tribulations**," or "**our tribulations**," as the appointed portion of the faithful, just as our Lord told His disciples, "*in the world ye shall have tribulations.*"

But the Apostle knew the sweet uses of adversity: he knew that "Christ nourisheth His Church by sufferings" (Jer. Taylor, "Faith and Patience of the Saints," part ii. 18), and that "*the chastening of the Lord*" is a discipline by which His children are prepared for glory. Therefore, looking through the clouds to the brightness beyond, he says, "**We rejoice also in our tribulations.**"

At once he justifies this boast by an appeal to the certain knowledge of Christian experience; "*knowing* (as we do) *that tribulation worketh patience.*" He thus comforts the weak-hearted, by showing how tribulation works its own cure; for its first fruit is "*patience.*" Our own word "*patience*" expresses little more than passive resistance to evil, the calm endurance of a soul that resigns itself to suffering. In this sense Julian used the Greek word in his scornful answer to the Christians who came before him to complain of persecution: "It is your part, when evil entreated, to be patient: for this is the commandment of your God."

But besides this passive element, the original word implies an active perseverance, a brave persistence in good works, that will not be shaken by fear of evil, and an abiding hope of final victory which no present dangers may disturb.

The word "*worketh*" (κατεργάζεται), describes, not a transient operation, but a complete and permanent result; patience does not pass away with the affliction that calls it into exercise, but remains as an effect *wrought out* upon the soul; an effect productive in its turn of a new fruit—"*experience.*"

4. *And patience, experience.*] *And patience* **approval.** "*Experience*" does not exactly represent the Greek word δοκιμή. Metal that is purified in fire gains thereby an approved character; the fire in which man is purified is "affliction," the right endurance of which is "patience," and its result a certain quality or character marking the man of "proof." Δοκιμή sometimes means the process of this moral "assaying" (2 Cor. viii. 2, Wiclif), or "probation;" but here, as an effect wrought by "*patience*," it must rather be the result of the process "proof," or "**approval.**" (Five Clergymen.)

*and experience, hope.*] "**Approval**" in its turn worketh hope, being in its very nature a pledge of perseverance unto the end.

Thus through a series of virtues each in its turn effect and cause, tribulation is "the nurse of our hope in the world to come." (Cyril Alex.)

5. *And hope maketh not ashamed.*] The hope fostered by this stern nurture is, as before, "*the hope of the glory of God.*" The distinction so finely drawn out by Dr. Chalmers ('Lectures on Romans,' I. p. 284) between "the hope of faith" (*v.* 2) and "the hope of experience" (*v.* 4) must not be pressed too far. The same hope, which springs at first simply from faith in God, is strengthened by the victorious issue of the trials to which it is subjected through tribulation.

This hope, unlike that which rests on man, can never by its failure put us to shame, because it is founded upon God's unchanging love.

*because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts.*] Read, *because* **God's love has been poured out** *in our hearts.* Augustine understands by "*the love of God*," not that wherewith He loves us, but that wherewith He makes us to love Him." ('De Spir. et Lit.' c. 32.)

This interpretation had been previously rejected by Origen as unsuited to the connexion of thought. The whole context shows that the Apostle means God's love towards us; the believer's hope rests not on anything in himself—not even on the happy consciousness of loving God—but on God's love to him in Christ, that love which is set forth in the following verses.

It is no valid objection to say that only the

Digitized by Google

because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.

6 For when we were yet without strength, [1]in due time Christ died for the ungodly.

[1] Or, according to the time.

---

*sense* of God's love, not that love itself, can be poured out in the heart.

Like an overflowing stream in a thirsty land, so is the rich flood of Divine love poured out and shed abroad in the heart.

The sense of God's love is at once awakened, even as the eye has a sense of the light that fills it; nevertheless that which has been poured out in the heart is not our sense of God's love, but the love itself embodied in the word to which the Holy Ghost gives life and power. Thus the true sequence of thought is maintained; our hope cannot disappoint us, because God's love—which is its own witness in our heart—is a pledge for its fulfilment.

*by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.*] Read "**that was given**:" and see Note on Acts xix. 2, **Did ye receive** *the Holy Ghost* **when ye became believers?** Here, however, St. Paul means, not an extraordinary gift, but one common to all believers, as is seen from the effect ascribed to it—the pouring out of God's love in the heart.

If we ask how the Holy Spirit pours out the love of God in the heart, we may find the answer in our Lord's words: "He shall testify of Me:" "He shall glorify Me: for He shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you." Christ is the fountain from which God's love is poured forth in the heart.

**6-8.** That the hope founded on God's love cannot fail, is further proved in *vv.* 6–8, by a description of the surpassing greatness of that love, as shown in the fact that Christ died for us while we were still in our helpless and ungodly state.

**6.** *For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.*] Rather, *Christ died* **in due time for the ungodly.** On the various readings see Note at the end of the chapter.

The words, "*when we were yet without strength*," do not present man's helplessness as a *motive* of God's love (Meyer): the suggestion of a motive would only weaken the thought of the passage, that God's love was shown when there was nothing in man to invite, but everything to repel it. The clause forms part of the contrast between the believer's present state, strong in hope, in patience, in experience, and in the assurance of God's love, and the former state in which men weakened by sin and not yet having the gift of the Holy Ghost had neither the will nor the power to please God.

The phrase, "*in due time*" or "in season" (κατὰ καιρόν) has been variously explained as (1) a time appointed by the Father, or (2) foretold by the prophets, or (3) opportune for St. Paul and his first readers; as if, in order to bring home more directly to that generation the sense of God's love, the Apostle had said, "Christ died opportunely for *us*: had He come later, *we* should have passed away unredeemed."

Such a thought is far too narrow and too selfish for St. Paul.

(4) The general state of the world was opportune for God's purpose.

By the contact of the Jews with the empire of Rome and the literature of Greece, the one true God must now become known to all, and therefore the partial and temporary dispensation must give place to the universal and final. "We believe that the wide empire of Rome was prepared by God's providence, in order that the nations which were to be called into the one body of Christ might be previously associated under the law of one empire." ('De Vocatione Gentium,' ii. 16.)

Man, the heir of the promise, was no longer a child to be kept under tutors and governors (Gal. iv. 2): with the growth of moral consciousness sin had reached its full development as positive transgression, and so the time for working a radical cure had arrived.

The common fault of such explanations is that they are arbitrary and have no support in the context: the one point there presented is that the time was opportune for showing the greatness of God's love. Whatever preparation the world had undergone, it was still lying visibly in ungodliness; and whatever other effects had been wrought by previous dispensations, they had helped to make man's weakness and unworthiness more manifest. Redemption effected under such conditions was seen to be the gift of God's free grace, not purchased or prepared by any partial improvement on man's part. Thus in accordance with the purpose of Him who justifieth the ungodly, Christ "**died in due time for the ungodly**": not for "*the ungodly*" as a class distinct from the godly, but for all *as being ungodly*. This is shown by the absence of the article in the Greek, as in the passage, "*I came not to call (the) righteous.*" God's love is magnified by the strong description of our unworthiness, as in iv. 5, where see Note on ἀσεβής.

**7, 8.** Christ's dying for the ungodly is now shown to be a thing altogether surpassing all experience of human love: for among men

Digitized by Google

7 For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die.

8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

9 Much more then, being now

---

scarcely can any be found who will die for a righteous man, much less, as Christ did, for sinners and ungodly.

7. *For scarcely for a righteous man will one die.*] There is a distinction between the "*righteous*" or "just" man, who does simply what duty requires of him, and the "*good man*," whose benevolence, not being limited to the requirements of strict duty, may call forth such gratitude and love, that for him "peradventure some one even has the heart to die."

Thus, while the possibility implied in the former clause is more distinctly conceded, it is at the same time limited to rare examples of love inspired by the most attractive form of virtue. The more exalted the virtue which alone calls forth such love, the stronger is the contrast to the ungodliness and enmity of those for whom Christ died; and it is precisely this contrast which sets God's love above all human love. See note at end.

8. *But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.*] "*Commendeth*," an excellent rendering, fully justified by St. Paul's usage (2 Cor. iii. 1; iv. 2; v. 12, &c.), and by the context. Christ's death for sinners not merely *proves* God's love to be a fact, but sets it before us in all its greatness and excellence, and so "*commends*" it to us.

The use of the present tense, and the frequent repetition in this verse of the first person, show how vividly St. Paul realised and appropriated the proof of God's love. Christ died once for all, yet in the enduring benefits of His death we have an ever-present proof of the Divine love to each of us.

The expression "*yet sinners*" conveys the idea that there was nothing in man to deserve God's love: compare *v.* 6.

Observe also, it is "**his own love** *towards us*" that God thus commends: "**his own**" (τὴν ἑαυτοῦ) in its origin, springing from the depths of the Divine nature; not called into existence by any goodness in its object (as in the supposed case of *v.* 7), for "*we were yet sinners;*" not a response to any love of ours, for we were His enemies. "*Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*" (1 Joh. iv. 10).

Thus the chief thought of our passage is seen to be the contrast between God's love and man's love, not the distinction between the Father's love and Christ's love. Nevertheless, it is *the Father's* love that thus surpasses all human love, and is proved by His giving His Son to die for His enemies. Two thoughts are thus suggested:

First, God's wrath against sin, is not inconsistent with the tenderest love towards sinners.

Secondly, the proof of God's love towards us, drawn from Christ's death, is strong in proportion to the closeness of the union between God and Christ.

Where would be the greatness of God's love, or how could it be compared to an act of self-sacrifice, if He, whom God gave to be a sacrifice for us, were not His own Son—His only begotten, His beloved?

*Christ died for us.*] Not "in our stead" (ἀντί), but "in our behalf" (ὑπέρ). See Note at end of chapter.

The ideas which ὑπέρ expresses, and ἀντί does not, are precisely those which make the death of Christ most precious. It would be enough to say that Christ died "in our stead" (ἀντί), if His death had been unconscious, unwilling, or accidental. But if as our champion, friend, and brother, He laid down His own life willingly for our sake, and if He was approved by God as our representative, so that when "*one died for all, then* **all died**," in and with Him (2 Cor. v. 15), then these thoughts must be expressed by saying, as St. Paul does, that He died ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, in our behalf, and for our sake.

9. St. Paul has been showing that the hope of glory cannot fail, because it is founded on God's love, as manifested in the death of Christ (*vv.* 5–8). He now draws out more fully the force of this argument, by contrasting past circumstances with present.

*Then* we were sinners, *now* we have been justified by Christ's blood; if He died for *sinners*, much more certain is it that He will save the *justified*.

The expression, "*justified by his blood*," is worthy of note.

(1) Why is no mention made of faith?

Because St. Paul is here viewing justification simply as a proof of God's love; and faith adds nothing to the gift of God, but only accepts it.

(2) It might be inferred from iv. 25 that our justification is less closely connected with our Lord's death than with His resurrection; that such an inference would be erroneous, is at once shown by the words, "*justified by his blood*."



Digitized by Google

justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the

---

In fact, in one of its aspects, "justification of sinners comes to the same with remission" of sins. (Waterland, 'Euch.' c. ix.; Bull, 'Harm. Apost.' c. i. § 4.)

"**The wrath**" from which we *shall be* saved, cannot but be "*the wrath to come*" (ii. 5, 8; iii. 5; 1 Thess. i. 10). The believer hopes for greater things than merely to be saved from the wrath of God. But the apostle, by presenting salvation under this limited aspect, strengthens his argument for its certainty. If we have already received from God so great favour as to be reconciled and justified, much more shall we be saved from His wrath.

10. *For if, when we were enemies, &c.*] *For if,* **being** *enemies, we were reconciled to God* **through** *the death of his son, much more* **having been** *reconciled, we shall be saved* **in** *his life.* The preceding argument is both repeated in a more precise statement, and strengthened by another element of contrast between the past and the present; (1) if, *being enemies,* we were reconciled, much more, having *been reconciled,* we shall be saved; (2) if we were reconciled by the *death* of His Son, much more shall we be saved by His *life.*

(1) In what sense it is here said that we were "*enemies*" to God, and were "*reconciled*" to Him, cannot be decided by the mere words, for these are used to express relations existing on either side, or on both. We must look to the context, and to the scope of the argument.

"*Reconciled,*" in *v.* 10, corresponds to "*justified,*" in *v.* 9; and again, in *v.* 11, it is said, "*we have* RECEIVED *the* **reconciliation.**" It is thus clear that "*reconciliation*" is a boon which God bestows; we are reconciled to Him, when we are restored to His favour: "*God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.*" (2 Cor. v. 19.)

From this meaning of "*reconciliation,*" that of "*enemies*" is at once deduced. By God's enemies are here meant those who lie under His wrath, and they are reconciled to Him, when that wrath is removed in the remission of sins.

The same conclusion follows from the general scope of the argument. Throughout the passage (*vv.* 1–11) our hope is shown to rest, not on anything in man, but solely on God's love. How is it consistent with this, to ground the greater certainty of salvation upon any change in our feeling towards God?

(1) The first change wrought through Christ's death, is not in man's feeling, but in his state, and consequently in his relation to an unchanging God.

This interpretation of the passage may be confirmed by considering some of the difficulties which have been felt concerning it.

If God loved us when we were yet sinners (*v.* 8), how could we be at the same time regarded by Him as enemies?

Does St. Paul speak only in a figure of God being angry? Or, is God's anger nothing else than the misery which, by His appointment, waits on sin?

We must remember that to describe God's moral attributes, man has no other words than those which are borrowed from his own nature.

It may not be possible to divest such words as "anger," "hatred," and "love," of some associations which, being *merely* human, are inappropriate to God.

But man's moral nature (we speak not now of its corruption, but of its essence) is the image of God. And when we say that God *loveth* righteousness and *hateth* iniquity, we mean a *love* and a *hate* which are real, personal, and conscious. Compare Hooker, 'E. P.,' Bk. V., Appendix i. vol. ii. p. 570 (Keble's edition).

Thus it is no figure, but a deep and essential truth, that God hates sin; and since sin is necessarily personal, *the sinner as such,* i.e. "so far as he wilfully identifies himself with his sin" (Godet), is hated of God, His enemy (c. xi. 28).

But God loves everything that He has made. He cannot love man *as a sinner,* but He loves him *as man,* even *when* he is a sinner. In like manner the Jews are described as being at the same time enemies in one relation and beloved in another (xi. 28).

Human love here offers a true analogy: the more a father loves his son, the more he hates *in him* the drunkard, the liar, or the traitor.

Thus God, loving as His creatures those whom He hates as self-made sinners, devises means whereby they may be brought back unto Him.

By the death of His Son, sins are put away; man, being represented by Christ, is no longer a sinner in God's sight, but righteous, and as such reconciled or restored to His favour.

Hence the force of the Apostle's argument: if God's love reconciled us when we were His enemies, much more will it save us, after we have been reconciled.

(2) The verse contains a second contrast between the means of our reconciliation, and

Digitized by Google

death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

11 And not only *so*, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.

12 Wherefore, as by one man

---

of our continued salvation: if reconciled through the *death* of His Son, much more shall we be saved in His *life*, not merely "*by*" but "**in** *his life*," as partakers thereof. (Compare John v. 26; xiv. 19.)

Some have thought that the point of comparison here is power.

Christ in His death sank in humiliation and weakness under the wrath of God. Christ now liveth as our eternal Mediator, Intercessor, and King, unto whom all power is given in heaven and in earth. If His death had power to restore us to God's favour, how much more shall His life have power to save us from wrath?

But throughout the passage from *v.* 5, St. Paul speaks, not of God's *power*, but of His *love*, as the foundation of our hope. It was a greater trial of love to reconcile us by Christ's death, than to save us in His life; it cost more to redeem us at first, than it will now cost to save us unto the end. The argument is *à fortiori*, from the greater to the less.

11. *And not only so, but we also joy in God.*] On the reading and construction, see the note at the end of the chapter.

From the fact of our having been reconciled to God (*v.* 10), two results follow, *not only* a future salvation, *but also* a present rejoicing in God.

The train of thought, and the word rendered "*joy*" or "**rejoice**," are the same as in *vv.* 1, 2; and here, as there, St. Paul reminds us that our glorying in God is maintained through the same Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we, who were formerly enemies, have now been reconciled to God.

*the atonement*] Read, *the* **reconciliation**, as in xi. 15, and 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. The word "*atonement*," which in the O. T. constantly means "expiation," occurs in the N. T. only here, being substituted for the proper word "**reconciliation**."

### 12–21. As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

So far, St. Paul has shown that sin is *in fact* universal in mankind, and that through Christ alone God has provided *for all* righteousness and life. He now deepens and strengthens his argument by showing that *the cause* of this universality of sin, and of its consequence, death, is the unity of mankind in Adam; and that, corresponding to this, there is a higher unity in Christ, who thus, as the true head and representative of the human race, becomes by His obedience unto death, a source of life and righteousness for all.

It is thus evident that the comparison between Adam and Christ is no rhetorical illustration, but an earnest, argumentative statement of two great truths in their essential connexion, universal sinfulness and universal redemption.

The comparison is based upon the derivation of sin and death from Adam, which is thus treated as a known and admitted fact. St. Paul's representation of it is wholly derived from the original narrative in Genesis; he introduces no new feature, and it is therefore gratuitous to assume that he drew from any other source. Traces of the same doctrine in the Apocryphal books (Wisdom, ii. 24; Ecclesiasticus xxv. 24), and in Rabbinical writings, so far as they show the opinion prevalent among the Jews, may tend more or less to confirm, but cannot possibly weaken, the Apostle's testimony to the historical truth of the Fall, as the source of sin and death. (John viii. 44.)

The master-thought of the whole passage is that unity of *the many in the one*, which forms the point of comparison between Adam and Christ.

"Throughout he clings to "the one," and continually brings this forward, saying, "As by *one man* sin entered into the world," and "in the trespass of *the one the many* died," and "Not as through *one* having sinned is the gift," and "The judgment was from *one* unto condemnation," and again, "For if by the trespass of *the one* death reigned through *the one*," and "Therefore as through *one* trespass," and again, "As through the disobedience of *the one* man *the many* were made sinners," and he constantly repeats "the one," in order that when the Jew says to you, "How by the well-doing of *one*, Christ, was the world saved?" you may be able to say to him, "How by the disobedience of *one*, Adam, was the world condemned?" (Chrysostom.)

The same recapitulation of the human race in Adam and in Christ is taught in 1 Cor. xv. 22. "*For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*"

12. *Wherefore.*] "**For this cause,**"—namely, that Christ died and rose again for



Digitized by Google

sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, [1]for that all have sinned:

[1] Or, *in whom.*

---

us, that we might be justified and saved through Him (8–11).

*as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.*] *As* **through** *one man sin entered into the world, and* **through sin death.** The comparison here begun would be formally completed thus: "so by one man righteousness entered into the world, and life through righteousness." But after the digression in *vv.* 13, 14, St. Paul, instead of resuming his unfinished sentence, glides back, as his manner is (c. iii. 25, 26; Eph. iii. 3, 4), into his former course of thought in the words, "*Adam, who is a figure of him that was to come.*" The parenthesis assumed in the Authorised Version is thus seen to be inadmissible. The words, "**through one man,**" are placed first for the sake of emphasis, because they contain the point of comparison, and so affect the whole verse.

"*Sin*" is here viewed as a whole, and St. Paul points to the source from which all human sin has flowed; any distinction therefore between the propensity, the act, or the habit, would here be out of place.

"*The world,*" into which "*sin entered through one man,*" is the human race (c. iii. 19; xi. 15). The previous existence of sin and death outside the world of man, is a matter untouched by the Apostle's statement.

Why is not Eve mentioned, who sinned before Adam (2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Sirach xxv. 24)?

Because the exact point touched by St. Paul is not who first sinned, nor how sin arose *in* Adam, but how it became universal in mankind.

"*Adam was first formed, then Eve*" (1 Tim. ii. 13). "*The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man*" (1 Cor. xi. 8). Thus does St. Paul define the position of Adam as the founder and representative of the race, through whom life was transmitted to all, and with life also sin and death (Gen. v. 3).

*and death by sin.*] **and through sin death.** That death must here be understood in its primary sense as the death of the body, is clear from the connexion with *v.* 14, where no other meaning is admissible, and from the unmistakable reference to the narrative in Genesis (Gen. ii. 17), and the sentence there pronounced, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*" (Gen. iii. 19). See Wisdom ii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 21.

Though bodily death is regarded in Genesis and by St. Paul as the *divinely appointed punishment* of sin, it may be none the less its *natural consequence.* When the immortality, which would have been the reward of Adam's obedience, was forfeited by his sin, the earthly frame would *naturally* return to its dust. Here, however, the great truth asserted by St. Paul is, that bodily death is in man the result of sin; a view familiar to us as Christians, but not to the heathen, who regarded death, "not as a punishment, but as either a necessity of nature, or a rest from toils and troubles" (Cic. in Cat. iv. 7).

If we try to grasp more than is contained in the passage, by introducing the ideas of "moral death," and "the second death," we relax our hold on the fundamental truth that bodily death is the penalty of Adam's sin.

Nor is this an imaginary danger, for some have been led on so far as to deny that the death of the body was at all included in the death threatened to Adam as the penalty of his sin (August. Serm. ccxcix. 10, 11—against the Pelagians).

"Moral" or "spiritual death" is a figurative expression for sin itself, and therefore cannot be included in death, when death is distinguished—as here—from sin.

"*The second death,*" as is shown by the very phrase, and by the context in which it occurs (Rev. xx. 13, 14; xxi. 8), does not begin till after the general resurrection and the final judgment. To introduce such an idea into the present passage is to confound the last judgment, of which it is said, "*they were judged every man according to their works,*" with the judgment pronounced upon Adam in Gen. iii. 19, which extended in its effects equally to all his descendants, prior to any consideration of each man's works, and without any distinction between the evil and the good.

Erroneous views of the passage have arisen from overlooking several important considerations.

1. St. Paul brings into the comparison only those effects of Adam's transgression which are *transmitted to all* his posterity, namely the inheritance of death and of a sinful nature; while God's final judgment is based solely on personal and *individual* responsibility.

2. The death of Christ does not *precisely reverse* the effects of Adam's sin, it *overpowers* them by greater gifts.

3. The death of the body as denounced upon Adam could not be regarded as a merely temporary separation of body and soul, but only as the beginning of a permanent state. Hence the gloomy view of death which

Digitized by Google

13 (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the

---

pervades the Old Testament, except in a few remarkable prophecies. It was only when Christ "*brought life and immortality to light*" by His own resurrection, that the Christian view of death as a temporary separation of body and soul, a transition to a higher life, could be realised.

*and so*] *I.e.* **through sin** which had itself come in **through one man.**

*death passed upon all men.*] "**Passed through unto** *all men.*"

*for that all have sinned.*] Read "*for that all* **sinned.**"

On ἐφ' ᾧ see Note at end.

That dependence of the death of all upon the sin of one, which is already implied in the word "*so*," is more fully and precisely stated in the clause, "*for that all* **sinned.**" We have already remarked that the words "**through** *one man*" affect the whole verse: their influence on this last clause is most important, determining its meaning to be "for that all sinned *through one man*": compare 2 Cor. v. 14, "*If one died for all, then* **they all died,**" *i. e.* in the one. In both passages the Authorised Version ("*have* sinned," "*were* all *dead*") is inaccurate.

Sin and death not only "*entered into*" the human race, but also "*passed* **through**" to every member of it "*through one man.*"

That death extended to all is a patent fact: and since death entered "*through sin*" and "*so*" passed on, it is presupposed that "*all* **sinned.**" Only thus is the cause "*sin*" co-extensive with the effect "*death*": at the same time, since "*all* **sinned**" *through one*, it is equally true that "*by the offence of* **the one the many** *died*" (*v.* 15).

The Apostle's whole reasoning rests on these two principles: (1) Sin is the cause of death; (2) By virtue of the unity of mankind sin and death are both transmitted from one to all. Thus the sin of the many and the death of the many are included in the sin of the one and the death of the one, and there at their common source the connexion between sin and death is fixed once for all. "The covenant of life, entered into with Adam in his state of innocence, was by his sin made void, not only for himself, but also for his posterity; so that now all sons of Adam, as such" [i.e. *apart from Christ*], "are quite shut out from any promise of immortality, and subjected to a necessity of dying, without hope of resurrection. No proposition in all theology is more certain than this: for it is everywhere stated most plainly and expressly in the N. T. scriptures, especially in the Epistle to the Romans throughout almost the whole 5th chapter" (Bp. Bull, 'Examen Censuræ, Anim.' xvii. p. 208). Theodoret's comment, "For not on account of his forefather's sin, but on account of his own, each man receives the doom of death," is as directly opposed to St. Paul's argument as it is to experience and theology: the error arises from confounding the sentence of bodily death, which through one man's sin extended to all, with the sinner's final doom.

**13, 14.** St. Paul pursues the thought that "all sinned *through one*," and that *on this account* death passed upon all. His proof is drawn from the case of those who died before a law was given, and rests on the principle already stated in iv. 15, that "where no law is, there is no transgression."

First he states as a known fact that during the period from Adam to Moses, that is, "*until the law, there was sin in the world.*"

But as "*sin is not imputed,*" not **brought into account** against the sinner (see Philemon *v.* 18), "*when there is no law,*" men could not then bring upon themselves the penalty of death, as Adam did, because they could not sin, as Adam, against a known law. There was sin, but not in the form of transgression, and therefore not taken into account.

Their own sin then was not the cause that men died. But they *did* die: "*death reigned from Adam to Moses even over* **those who sinned not** *after the similitude of* **the** *transgression* **of Adam.**"

And as sin is the cause of death (*v.* 12), and Adam's sin alone could be taken into account, they died through Adam's sin. This is substantially Chrysostom's interpretation.

The unavoidable inference that *through one man's sin* all died is only for a moment deferred; in *vv.* 15, 17, and 19 it is affirmed in express terms.

Meanwhile through the introduction of Adam's name the Apostle is able to return to the comparison begun in *v.* 12. Thus the relative clause "*who is the figure of him that was to come*" serves a double purpose: it implies indirectly the conclusion to be drawn from *vv.* 13, 14, that all sinned and died in Adam, who is thus a "figure" or a "**type**" of Him in whom all are justified and made alive; and it enables St. Paul to resume and complete his unfinished comparison.

Digitized by Google

similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

15 But not as the offence, so also *is* the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much

---

This comparison is here confined to the effects in man of Adam's sin and of Christ's obedience: it does not embrace (as in 1 Cor. xv. 24–28) man's lordship over the creatures as typical of Christ's universal dominion in the "times of the restitution of all things." Our Authorised Version therefore rightly renders, "him which *was* to come," not "which *is* to come."

**15.** *But not as the offence, so also is the free gift.*] *But not as the* **trespass,** *so also is the* **act of grace.** The comparison between Adam and Christ is at the same time a contrast: they are alike in that they both stand at the head of the human race, and so extend the influence of their acts to all; unlike in the nature of those acts, and the consequences that flow from them. "Rabbi Yosé, the Galilaean said, 'Come forth and learn the righteousness of the King Messiah, and the reward of the just from the first man, who received but one commandment, a prohibition, and transgressed it: consider how many deaths were inflicted upon himself, upon his own generations, and upon those that followed them, till the end of all generations. Which attribute is the greater, the attribute of goodness, or the attribute of vengeance?' He answered, 'The attribute of goodness is the greater; and the attribute of vengeance is the less; how much more, then, will the King Messiah, who endures affliction and pains for the transgressors (as it is written, '*He was wounded,*' *&c.*), justify all generations! and this is what is meant, when it is said, '*And the Lord made the iniquity of us all meet upon him.*'" (Neubauer, 'Jewish Interpreters of Isai.,' liii. p. 11.)

The word rendered "*the offence*" is the same which is applied to Adam's sin in Wisdom x. 1, and there rendered "*his fall*": in the Gospels it is translated "*trespass*" (Mat. vi. 14; Mar. xi. 25). The strict contrast to Adam's *trespass* is Christ's *obedience*, but St. Paul, regarding them both chiefly in their influence on mankind, passes on at once to the effect of that obedience, namely the **act of grace** by which the effect of the **trespass** is annulled. On the various applications of χάρισμα see note on i. 11: here it indicates the act of God's free grace in pardoning and justifying.

*For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.*] Read: "*For if* **by the trespass of the one the many died,** *much more* **did** *the grace of God and* **his** *gift* **abound unto the many in the grace of the one** *man Jesus Christ.*" "*If*" does not here imply uncertainty, but lays a basis for argument: that "**by the trespass of the one the many died,**" has been already proved: much more certain is it that the grace abounded unto the many, for God's grace flows more freely than His wrath. The word rendered "*gift*" (δωρεά) is used in the New Testament only of God's greatest and best gifts, as Christ himself, the Holy Ghost, and his gifts (John iv. 10; Acts ii. 38; viii. 20; x. 45; 2 Cor. ix. 15; Eph. ii. 8; iv. 7): here it means "*the gift of righteousness*" (*v.* 17). "*The grace of God*" and "*his gift*" differ only as cause and effect; their essential unity is perhaps indicated in the Greek by the singular number of the verb which follows.

"*The grace of God*" abounded "**in the grace of the one man Christ Jesus,**" even as the water of the fountain abounds in the river.

"*The grace abounded*" in the sense that it was not limited to a reversal of the effects of Adam's sin: it did not restore in the same form that which had been lost in Adam, but bestowed far more in new and better gifts. The penalty of death is not abolished: but a new life is imparted, in which death itself is to be swallowed up at the resurrection: man is not put back into that unstable innocence from which Adam fell, but his sins are forgiven: the corruption of nature, which we inherit prior to any exercise of our own will, is compensated by those secret influences of the Spirit wherein He strives with us even against our will. And to those who will accept the grace, it brings both greater abundance of grace here, and the sure hope of glory hereafter.

"**The many**" unto whom the gift abounded "**by the grace of the one man Christ Jesus**" must include "**the many**" who died "**by the trespass of the one.**"

The gift "*abounded unto the many,*" inasmuch as Christ's redeeming work has won grace for all men: there is no limit in the gift itself, but only in man's willingness to accept it.

The Authorised Version loses the full meaning of the expression "**the** *one man,*" that is the head and representative of mankind, "*the last Adam,*" the beginning of the new creation, "*the firstborn among many brethren*" (Rom. viii. 29).

Digitized by Google

more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, *which is* by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

16 And not as *it was* by one that sinned, *so is* the gift: for the judgment *was* by one to condemnation, but the free gift *is* of many offences unto justification.

17 For if [1]by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

18 Therefore as [1]by the offence of one *judgment came* upon all men

[1] Or, *by one offence.*

[1] Or, *by one offence.*

---

**16.** *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift:*] This should be rendered as one clause: "**and the gift is not as through one having sinned.**"

In *v.* 15 the argument depends on the contrast in *the nature* of the trespass and the gift, that is of sin and grace: in *v.* 16 the contrast refers, not to *quality*, but to *quantity;* the gift of justification is greater than the condemnation, because it is occasioned, not by one offence, but by many. Adam received a law with a definite penalty attached to it; his sin was therefore a distinct and formal "trespass," which was at once "imputed" or taken into account. The command had been given to Adam while he was yet alone, "Thou shalt not eat," "in the day that thou eatest, thou shalt surely die:" so to Adam alone is the condemnation addressed, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But the sentence thus pronounced upon our first father alone extended in its effects to all his children: "*the judgment was* **from** *one unto condemnation.*" It was otherwise with the gift: "**the gift was not as through one having sinned.**" The one trespass from which judgment proceeded was followed (*when* and *how* we shall be told afterwards), by many trespasses, every one of which deserving condemnation became a fresh occasion for unmerited forgiveness: thus "*the free gift was* **from many trespasses** *unto justification.* "*Condemnation*" (κατάκριμα) and justification (δικαίωμα) here correspond to each other: each describes not an act in process, but an act done, a sentence passed. As one judgment unto condemnation extended to all, so for all there is but one free gift unto justification, the application of which to each believer is expressed by a different form of the word as a "justifying" (*v.* 18).

**17.** The statement that "*the free gift is unto justification,*" (*v.* 16), is now confirmed from the certainty that a still greater blessing will follow. The argument is no mere repetition of *v.* 15: it gathers up and carries onward the results already attained in *vv.* 15, 16; but it also adds a new contrast between the reign of death and the reign of the justified in life

The conclusion of *v.* 15, that "*the grace of God and* **his gift** *abounded unto* **the many,**" is here assumed in the words "*they which receive* **the abundance of the grace** *and of the gift of righteousness.*"

The conclusion of *v.* 16 is also assumed in the same clause: for as "*the free gift is unto justification,*" it is now more closely defined as "**the gift of** righteousness" and as received *now.*

They then who receive this gift of righteousness now will surely receive also the gift of life hereafter.

This assurance is not made to depend solely on the intrinsic connection between righteousness and life: it is made doubly sure by the contrast with the gloomy reign of sin and death.

*For if by one man's offence.*] The reading represented in the margin ("by one offence") has been adopted by some critics; but it has less authority, and does not agree so well with the corresponding clause at the end of the verse. Translate: "**For if by the trespass of the one** *death reigned* **through the one,** *much more they which receive* **the** *abundance of* **the** *grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life* **through the** one, Jesus Christ."

We may notice a difference of expression in the two clauses. "*Death reigned*"; under his tyranny man's free agency is destroyed: the justified shall themselves "*reign in life*"; for life eternal is the element in which man's personal and conscious activity shall find its glorious development. The blessing here promised is far more than the restoration of what was lost through Adam: it is promised therefore not to all unconditionally, but to those who *accept* that gift of righteousness which is offered to all.

**18.** *Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*] This verse gathers up the various contrasts of the whole passage (*vv.* 12–17) in a summary conclusion.

That the marginal renderings are the more correct, will be seen by comparing in the Greek *v.* 18 with *v.* 19. The Authorised

Digitized by Google

¹ Or, *by one righteousness.*

to condemnation; even so ¹by the righteousness of one *the free gift came* upon all men unto justification of life.

19 For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

---

Version supplies in the first clause "judgment came," and in the second "the free gift came": on grammatical and rhetorical grounds it is inconceivable that two subjects standing in contrast could both be thus omitted.

There is no complete proposition, but a kind of exclamation, which is perfectly intelligible without any addition.

"**So then as through one trespass, unto all men, to condemnation; so also through one justificatory sentence, unto all men, to justification of life.**"

St. Paul does not repeat the strictly logical contrast of *v.* 16, between "**trespass**" and "**gift of grace,**" "*condemnation*" and "**justificatory sentence;**" but advancing upon that conclusion, he now sets against the "**one trespass**" the "**one justificatory sentence,**" and against the "*condemnation,*" as reaching to all, the justifying process, or "*justification of life*" unto all.

The words "*all men*" must have the same extent in both clauses: and as the condemnation passed upon "*all men*" in the proper sense of the word "*all,*" so the "*one* **justificatory sentence**" leads in God's purpose unto justification of life for all. The realisation of this purpose in individual men depends upon their accepting by faith the justification designed for them. But it is not St. Paul's purpose to bring out here, more fully than he has already done in *v.* 17, this subjective condition of justification; he is speaking of the one justification through Christ as equally comprehensive with the one condemnation through Adam.

*justification of life*] "A justification by which we are recalled from the death of sin unto the life of grace and glory" (Corn. a Lapide). This interpretation is confirmed by *v.* 21, "*that grace might reign through righteousness unto eternal life.*" Compare Bull, 'Exam. Censuræ,' Anim. iii.

The genitive expresses the effect or purpose: "*justification*" is unto, or in order to, "*life*" (Winer, § 30; Green, § 270).

**19.** One point in the comparison is still incomplete. Adam's "*trespass*" has been contrasted, not, as we might have expected, with Christ's obedience, but with the moving cause of that obedience, His grace (*v.* 15), and with the result purchased by His obedience, and bestowed by His grace, "*the gift of righteousness*" (*v.* 17), and the "**justificatory sentence**" (*v.* 18).

It remains to show the means by which Christ's grace wrought these effects, viz., His obedience itself, and so to present the exact contrast to that one transgression, by which all were made sinners. This is now done, and the summary given in *v.* 18 is thereby explained and confirmed.

"*For as by* **the** *disobedience* **of the one man the** *many were made sinners, so* **also** *by the obedience of* **the** *one shall* **the** *many be made righteous.*"

The words "*were made sinners*" have been very variously interpreted: "became sinners," —"were proved to be,"—"were regarded and treated as being sinners,"—these all miss the exact force of the word (καθίστασθαι), which points to the *formal essence*, to that which *constitutes* men sinners. St. Paul has shown in *v.* 13 that sin may exist without being taken into account, i. e., without *formally constituting* the man a sinner. But Adam's disobedience, being a formal transgression, caused an essential and formal change in his moral state: he and all his descendants were at once formally constituted sinners ("peccatores constituti sunt," *Vulgate*), and as such were subjected to death. The clause states explicitly, what is already contained in *v.* 12, that "*through one man .... all sinned.*"

As Adam's disobedience consisted in one single act, so by the obedience contrasted with it, we must understand the one crowning act of Christ's obedience (Phil. ii. 8), His submission to death. Yet this death in its atoning power presupposes a sinless life: one act constitutes disobedience, but a perfect life is needful to a complete obedience.

The effect of Christ's obedience, like that of Adam's disobedience, is in its objective aspect universal and immediate. If we look only to Christ's work, and God's gift, all is at once completed. As in Adam the many were made sinners prior to any consideration of their own sins; so in Christ, solely on account of the merits of His obedience, apart from, and prior to any righteous deeds or dispositions of their own, the many shall "be *made righteous*" (κατασταθήσονται) i. e. not merely declared righteous, or put into the position of righteous men, and treated as such, but constituted righteous.

For as our union with Adam made us all participators in the effects of his transgression, and thereby constituted us sinners; so union with Christ, who is our righteousness, is that which constitutes us essentially and formally righteous.

Digitized by Google

20 Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

21 That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

---

The ideas of inherent sin and inherent righteousness belong to the following chapters: to introduce them by anticipation here is to confuse the Apostle's argument, which here regards justification in its objective aspect, as wrought by God through Christ.

The future "*shall be made righteous*," does not refer to the future judgment, for it is not St. Paul's habit to view justification as something future, but as present, and already attained. It is because justification, though perfected on Christ's part in one act, extends onwards in its effect to generations yet unborn, that it is described as future.

**20.** *Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound.*] "**But law came in beside, that the trespass might be multiplied.**"

As the sin of Adam and the grace of Christ have been presented as the main elements and moving powers in man's history, the question naturally occurs—what was the purpose of the law? What was its relation to sin and to righteousness?

Besides this general association with the preceding passage, the law has been expressly mentioned in it: "*Until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law*," *v.* 13. Why then, it may be asked, was the law given? What purpose did it serve?

Again, in *v.* 16, the one offence of Adam is contrasted with "*many trespasses*." Whence came these many trespasses? That question is now answered.

Sin had come into the world before (*v.* 12), and remained in the world (*v.* 13): **but** sin without law is not taken into account (*v.* 13), and does not constitute **trespass** or transgression (iv. 15): therefore **law came in beside** (sin), in order *that the* **trespass** *might* **be multiplied.** Compare Gal. iii. 19, "*The law was added because of* (**for the sake of**) *transgressions*."

Do these words attribute to God, as the author of the law, the purpose of increasing sin?

To answer this question fully here, would be to anticipate the course of St. Paul's own argument; for in c. vii. he enters into a full discussion of the nature and effect of the law. At present we must notice only such points as arise directly out of this passage.

1. According to Chrysostom and other Greek commentators, it is only an *effect* of the law, not a *purpose*, that is stated. But this interpretation weakens the natural force of the Apostle's words, and only partially solves the difficulty: for an *effect* of the law must have been foreseen, and therefore in some sense included in its purpose.

2. The words mean, not "that the trespass might increase" merely in man's consciousness and knowledge of it, but "might be multiplied actually": this sense is also required by the connexion with the "many offences" in *v.* 16, which cannot but be actual.

But on the other hand we must observe that—

3. The purpose stated is not that *sin*, but that "*the* **trespass**" might increase; that sin which already existed, however dormant or unrecognised (vii. 7, 8, 13), might take the definite form of active "trespass," or transgression of a known law. That *sin* itself increased is stated in the next clause, not as a *purpose*, but as an *effect*, and that an effect overruled for good by the superabundance of grace.

4. The increase of the **trespass** is not *the primary purpose* of the law, corresponding to God's *principal* or *signified* will, which is that men should observe the law to do it. Compare Hooker, 'Eccl. Pol.' B. v. Appendix I., p. 573, in Keble's edition.

5. It is not *the ultimate purpose* of the law, but only an intermediate purpose, a mean to an end: the ultimate purpose is "*that grace might reign through righteousness*." (*v.* 21.)

*But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.*] The Authorised Version uses the same word "*abound*" for two different Greek words: render, "*but where sin* **multiplied**, *grace* **superabounded**," so as to surpass the increase of sin.

**21.** "In this, God acted, not with cruelty but for the purpose of healing. For sometimes a man thinks himself whole, and is sick; and inasmuch as he is sick, and perceives it not, he seeks not a physician: the disease is increased, the inconvenience grows, the physician is sought, and all is healed" (Augustine, Ps. cii. 15).

Here St. Paul speaks more strongly of the increased power of sin, when the remedy appears, and God's full purpose is declared. Yet he does not say, as in the Authorised Version, "Sin hath reigned *unto* death," but "**in** *death*," as a province which it had won, and wherein it exercised its dominion. Death therefore, must be understood in the same sense, as in *vv.* 12, 14.

Digitized by Google

But the reign of sin and death has been overpowered by the superabundance of grace, "*that grace might reign* UNTO *eternal life.*" Grace is conquering, and has yet to conquer, the kingdom of sin and death, before it can enter into the full possession of its own kingdom. This conquest it carries on through its own royal gift of "*righteousness:*" the boundless realm *unto* which it shall attain, but which will still stretch out for ever and ever before it, is "*eternal life.*"

Once again in sight of that kingdom our thoughts are turned to the King Himself. "Of Adam we hear no more: Christ alone is remembered" (Bengel). Grace shall "*reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*"

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12.

The Margin, "let us have peace with God," represents a reading ἔχωμεν attested by a great majority of uncial MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and adopted by Tischendorf (8), Tregelles, Westcott, Fritzsche, Hofmann, &c. On the other hand, ἔχομεν is found in B³ ℵᵃ F G (not in f g) P, most cursives, the later Syriac, and a few Fathers, including probably Tertullian, who seems to be wrongly claimed for the other reading: ἔχομεν is preferred on internal grounds by Meyer, De Wette, Lange, Philippi, Reiche, Cremer, Scrivener, McClellan, Alford, Wordsworth.

There is a similar variation between ἔχομεν and ἔχωμεν in Hebrews xii. 28. Here the reading ἔχωμεν, having so great a preponderance of external testimony, the first duty of candid criticism is to consider whether it offers any meaning in harmony with the context.

1. Fritzsche, who prefers ἔχωμεν, writes thus: "It is evident that, if you replace ἔχωμεν in *v.* 1, καυχώμεθα in *vv.* 2, 3 is Conjunctive, not Indicative." But Fritzsche has overlooked the fact that the Conjunctive Mood is absolutely excluded by the categorical negative (οὐ) which follows: the force of this argument is not affected by the various reading καυχώμενοι, *v.* 3.

2. Hofmann, avoiding Fritzsche's error, throws the emphasis on the words "*through Jesus Christ,*" and makes the two clauses καὶ ἐσχήκαμεν and καὶ καυχώμεθα parallel to each other. "Because it is Jesus Christ through whom we not only have had our access to this grace wherein we stand, but also rejoice in hope of the glory of God; therefore we may be exhorted that through Him we should let our relation to God be a relation of peace."

To this interpretation, which is substantially that of Origen and Chrysostom, several objections are made.

(1) "The emphasis, which obviously rests in the first instance on δικαιωθέντες and then on εἰρήνην, is taken to lie on διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰ. Χ." (Meyer).

We may answer that these important words are naturally brought as close as possible to the relative clause dependent on them, and at the same time receive the emphasis which belongs to the close of the sentence.

(2) The exhortation, "let us have peace with God, and not become His enemies again through fresh sins," is said to be out of place in this 5th chapter, throughout which St. Paul is stating the actual effects of justification, "*we have peace with God,*" and "*we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.*"

To this we may reply, that the Apostle, beginning his exhortation in v. 1, and grounding it upon the benefits already received through Christ, is led on into a fuller statement of the nature, cause, and extent of those benefits (*vv.* 3–21), and only resumes his practical exhortation in vi. 1.

(3) Mr. Scrivener concludes, "that the itacism ω for ο, so familiar to all collators of Greek manuscripts, crept into some very early copy, from which it was propagated among our most venerable codices, even those from which the earliest versions were made:—that this is one out of a small number of well-ascertained cases in which the united testimonies of the best authorities conspire in giving a worse reading than that preserved by later and (for the most part) quite inferior copies."

Against this we may fairly set the opposite conclusion of Tischendorf that the testimony for ἔχομεν is obviously overpowered by that in favour of ἔχωμεν, and therefore "ἔχωμεν cannot be rejected unless it be altogether inappropriate, and inappropriate it seemingly is not."

Without presuming to decide between such accomplished critics, we are bound to express our own opinion that the internal grounds of objection to ἔχωμεν are *not* sufficient to outweigh the great preponderance of external testimony in its favour: but in a case where scholars of the greatest authority differ so widely, we think it better to retain in our footnotes and revised Version the reading of the received Text.

**6.** I. Ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν

Digitized by Google

κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν. This is the reading of the Textus Receptus, and is found in D[c] K P 17 37 47 Arm.

II. The same reading with the addition of a second ἔτι after ἀσθενῶν is found in ℵ A C D* 31 (istud omnium corruptionum receptaculum, *Reiche*) 137 Syr[p].

III. Instead of ἔτι γάρ the following variations are found:

(1) εἴ γε B fuld. Aeth.
(2) εἰ γάρ Cop. Isid. Pelus. August. (" *si enim*," Epist. 149, De Pecc. Merit. i. 43)
(3) εἰ δέ Syr. (Schaaf)
(4) ἔτι δέ L
(5) εἰς τί γάρ D[b] F G
ut quid enim d e f g Vulg. Iren. Faustin.

Of these authorities B D[b] F G August. add the second ἔτι after ἀσθενῶν.

On this evidence we have to make the following remarks.

(a) The position of the first ἔτι, separated by Χριστός from the words to which it belongs (ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν) is very unusual. Reiche in his Critical Commentary excuses it on the ground that St. Paul wished to give emphasis to both thoughts, (1) that it was *Christ the Son of God* who died; (2) that He died while we were yet sinners. But this explanation is far from satisfactory.

(b) The double ἔτι has never been satisfactorily explained, and the connexion which Tischendorf indicates by his punctuation, ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι, is opposed to the rule, universally observed in the N. T., that ἔτι in a Participial clause precedes the Participle.

On the other hand, the repetition of ἔτι is very easily explained by the confusion of the various readings.

(c) Of the variations for ἔτι γάρ the most noticeable is III. (5) εἰς τί γάρ. It is thought by Reiche to have been formed from the Latin "ut quid enim," and "ut quid" is used in the Vulgate for εἰς τί, e.g. Matt. xxvi. 8, Mar. xiv. 4, as well as for ἵνα τί, Matt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46, Lu. xiii. 7, Acts vii. 26, 1 Cor. x. 29.

Stieren (Irenæus, l. III. c. xvi. § 9) acutely remarks that Irenæus seems to have read ἵνα τί γάρ. We may add, that owing to the preceding ημων, ινα τι would easily lose its first syllable, and the remaining letters ατι be changed into ετι. Ἵνα τί γάρ, or εἰς τί γάρ, with the same general sense as the received reading, would give a livelier turn to the expression: "For to what purpose (if our hope is after all to disappoint us) did Christ die, &c.?"

Dr. Westcott ('Dict. Bib.' ii. 530a) suggests that there is a corruption earlier than any remaining document. We believe that the original reading is represented in the Latin "ut quid enim Christus, quum adhuc infirmi essemus, secundum tempus pro impiis mortuus est?" (Vulg. Iren. &c.), and that it ran thus: ἵνα τί γὰρ Χριστὸς ἔτι ἀσθενῶν ἡμῶν ὄντων κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν; The position of ἔτι indicated by the Latin is confirmed by Epiphanius (Marcion, 369), who quotes the words ἔτι ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν, in this order.

7. Is there any distinction between ὑπὲρ δικαίου and ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ?

(i.) The whole context, before and after, has reference to dying for *men;* and the antithesis both to ἀσεβῶν (*v.* 6) and ἁμαρτωλῶν (*v.* 8), demands the masculine sense here in both adjectives.

(ii.) The first sentence is virtually negative (μολίς), and δικαίου therefore indefinite, and without the article; the affirmative sentence assumes a definite instance marked by the article (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ).

(iii.) Is there any distinction or gradation of sense between δίκαιος and ἀγαθός?

Iren. I. xxvii. 1. τὸν μὲν δίκαιον, τὸν δὲ ἀγαθὸν ὑπάρχειν.

Clement. 'Hom.' iv. c. 13. ἀγαθὸν μὲν ὡς μεταμελομένοις χαριζόμενον τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, δίκαιον δὲ ὡς ἑκάστῳ μετὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πεπραγμένων ἐπεξιόντα.

Ammonius, κακὸς πονηροῦ διαφέρει ὥσπερ ὁ ἄκακος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.

Phavorinus, ἀγαθὸς ὁ τὰ καλὰ χαριζόμενος ἀφθόνως.

Xenoph. 'Agesil.' xi. § 8, χρήμασί γε μὴν οὐ μόνον δικαίως ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐλευθερίως ἔχρητο, τῷ μὲν δικαίῳ ἀρκεῖν ἡγούμενος ἐᾶν τὰ ἀλλότρια, τῷ δὲ ἐλευθερίῳ καὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προσωφελητέον εἶναι.

From these and other passages, adduced by various Commentators, the distinction is clear.

That it is retained in the N. T. see Matt. xx. 15; Lu. xxiii. 50; Rom. vii. 12; Trench, 'N. T. Synonymes,' 2nd Series, ἀγαθωσύνη; Cremer's 'Lexicon' (ἀγαθός) and Grimm, 'Clavis N. T. Philol.'

If, as many think, there is no difference or gradation between δίκαιος and ἀγαθός in the present passage, its meaning is: "For scarcely for a righteous man will any die: *scarcely* I say, for perhaps for such a man some one may even dare to die."

(*a*) The second sentence is in this case certainly superfluous; for in μολίς "scarcely" with the *improbability*, the *possibility* also is implied.

The needless modification only weakens the previous statement; and Jerome's admission "pendulo gradu sententiam temperat.'

Digitized by Google

describes a mode of reasoning very unlike St. Paul's. But if ἀγαθός describes a more generous and attractive quality than δίκαιος, then there is reason for noticing the possible exception: what will *hardly* be done for the man who is merely just, may *perhaps* be done for the good and generous man.

(*b*) Meyer argues that the Apostle's object is "to make the *character* of the man for whom some one might perhaps make this self-sacrifice, more distinctly felt, for the sake of the contrast:" an argument which tends to prove, not that ἀγαθός is a simple equivalent to δίκαιος, but that it is more forcible and emphatic. Its prominent position at the beginning of the sentence points the same way.

(*c*) Again, it is urged that δίκαιος cannot mean simply a just, honest, upright man, but must have the wider sense "*righteous*," *i. e.* righteous before God, as well as before man, because of the contrast with ἁμαρτωλῶν, v. 8.

Meyer here falls into confusion, from not observing that in the actual case of Christ's dying *for* man, ἁμαρτωλός, ἐχθρός, and ἀσεβής describe man's character "*coram Deo:*" while in the illustration, where man dies for his fellow man, δίκαιος and ἀγαθός are both limited to human relations, and have their distinct and proper meaning.

8. *died for.*] *I. e.* "in behalf of" ὑπέρ; not "instead of" ἀντί. When David cries, "Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom my son, my son!" (2 Sam. xviii. 33), we find in the LXX ἀντί σου. But in fact ἀντί is never used of Christ's *dying for us*, and "in doctrinal passages relating to Christ's death (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; xiv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18, &c.), it is not justifiable to render ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, and the like, rigorously by '*instead of*,' merely on account of such parallel passages as Matt. xx. 28, λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν." (Winer, 'Gr. N. T.', part iii., sect. 47, E. T.)

When Pylades would die for Orestes, or Alcestis for her husband, various prepositions may be used, ἀντί, ὑπέρ, περί, πρό: but each has its own proper meaning. For θνήσκειν with ὑπέρ, see Eur. 'Alcestis,' 155, 284, 682, 690, 701; with ἀντί, 434, 524, 716. That ἀντί expresses the bare external substitution of one for another, is evident from such passages as the following:—

ἐγώ σε πρεσβεύουσα κἀντὶ τῆς ἐμῆς
ψυχῆς καταστήσασα φῶς τόδ' εἰσορᾶν.
('Alc.' 283.)

σὺ νῦν γενοῦ τοῖσδ' ἀντ' ἐμοῦ μήτηρ τέκνοις.
(ib. 377.)

σὺ τὸν αὐτᾶς ἔτλας πόσιν ἀντὶ σᾶς
αμεῖψαι ψυχᾶς ἐξ Ἅιδα. (ib. 461.)

This proper sense of ἀντί could not possibly be expressed by ὑπέρ; nor can ἀντί express the sense of ὑπέρ, "on behalf of," "for the good of," derived from its use in the local sense of bending "*over*" one to protect and defend him. Compare 2 Macc. viii. 21, ἑτοίμους ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνήσκειν, also vi. 28; vii. 9; and Ignat. ad Rom. 4, ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω.

In the passages cited by Raphel on Rom. v. 8, and accepted by Magee as "indisputable" ('Atonement,' i. 245), the idea of substitution is not conveyed by ὑπέρ, but by the context. See especially Xen. 'Anab.' VII. iv. 9.

11. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα. All modern Editors read καυχώμενοι with ℵ B C D, &c. The reading καυχώμεθα may be due to *v.* 3, and to the difficulty of finding any regular construction for the Participle, which is still variously explained.

(1) "And not only [as reconciled], but also as those who rejoice in God" (Meyer).

For this view it may be said that the greater the present blessing, the more certain is the future salvation. Now the reconciliation mentioned in verse 10, does not fully express the blessing upon which the believer has already entered, for this includes also a joyful confidence in God.

It is, however, much more simple to refer οὐ μόνον δέ to the principal thought σωθησόμεθα.

(2) "And not only [shall be saved], but also saved in such a manner that we shall rejoice in our salvation" (Fritzsche, Godet, Winer, § 45).

In this, as in the former explanation, the sense appears to be sacrificed to the grammar, for it is more natural that καυχώμενοι, like καυχώμεθα in *vv.* 2, 3, should refer to a present rejoicing.

(3) *And not only* [shall be saved], *but we also* **rejoice** *in God through our Lord Jesus Christ*, **through** *whom we have now received the* **reconciliation**."

This is the interpretation of Origen, in Cramer's 'Catena,' and of Theodoret: it admits a slight irregularity of construction, but tains the natural meaning of the passage.

12. For the use of ἐφ' ᾧ in classical authors, see Thuc. i. 113, Polyb. 'Hist.' i. 59, where the future indicative follows; and Xenoph. 'Agesilaus' iv. 1, 'Hellen.' ii. c. 2, § 20, where the infinitive follows.

The present or past indicative seems to be rare; but an example is given by Phavorinus: ἐφ' ᾧ ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι λέγουσιν Ἀττικοὶ μετὰ πνευμάτων διαστολῆς· οἷον, ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν κλοπὴν εἰργάσω.

In 2 Cor. v. 4, and in Rom. v. 12, it is well rendered in the Authorised Version "*for that.*"

Digitized by Google

These two passages are discussed by Photius, Epist. 14 (ed. J. N. Baletta, 1864) *τούτου δὴ τὴν διάνοιαν οἱ μὲν "ἐφ' ᾧ—τῷ 'Αδάμ," οἱ δὲ "ἐφ' ᾧ—τῷ θανάτῳ" συνυπακούοντες ἀποδιδόασιν. ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐδέτερον δοκεῖ· οὐδὲ γάρ τι συναπακούειν δεῖ, αὐτόθεν ἔχοντος τοῦ ῥητοῦ τὴν ἐντέλειαν· τὸ γὰρ "ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον" νῦν οὐ προσώπου τινός, οὐδ' οἷον προσώπου δεικτικόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' αἰτίας μάλιστα παραστατικόν· οἷον, "ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον = διότι πάντες ἥμαρτον." κ.τ.λ.*

In Phil. iii. 12, the only other passage of the New Testament in which *ἐφ' ᾧ* is used, the same sense is very suitable. Œcum. *ἢ τὸ "ἐφ' ᾧ" "ἐπειδὴ" νόει, ἵνα οὕτως ᾖ· διώκω δὲ εἰ καταλάβω, ἐπειδὴ κἀγὼ κατελήμφθην.*

In all three passages *ἐφ' ᾧ* seems to be equivalent to *ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ὅτι.*

That Origen so understood the passage seems probable from his paraphrase of it, 'Comm. in Evang. Joh.' tom. xx. § 33: *θανάτου εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διεληλυθότος ἐπὶ τῷ πάντας ἡμαρτηκέναι.*

---

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *We may not live in sin*, 2 *for we are dead unto it*, 3 *as appeareth by our baptism*. 12 *Let not sin reign any more*, 18 *because we have yielded ourselves to the service of righteousness*, 23 *and for that death is the wages of sin.*

WHAT shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?

2 God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?

---

### CHAP. VI.—THE MORAL EFFECTS OF JUSTIFICATION.

The purpose of the chapter is to show that "the righteousness of God" revealed in the Gospel, and described in the preceding chapters, so far from affording any pretext for immorality, is the only sure foundation of practical holiness.

**1.** *What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?*] We have already seen (iii. 8) that the doctrine of justification by faith without works of law was commonly misrepresented by enemies as an encouragement to do evil that good might come; and apart from any such calumny there was some real danger that the doctrine might be abused (Gal. v. 13).

In passing on, therefore, to consider its moral consequences, St. Paul first brings forward, in the form of a question for deliberation, the objection which might be made to his statement in ch. v. 20, 21, concerning the purpose of the law, and its relation to sin and grace.

"*What shall we say then?*" What inference shall we draw for our moral guidance from the fact that, "*where sin* **multiplied,** *grace did* **superabound?**" Are we to continue in sin, in order that God's "*grace may* **be multiplied,**" and be more abundantly displayed?

'Επιμένωμεν, the genuine reading, is the subjunctive of deliberation.

**2.** *God forbid.*] See ch. iii. 4. The thought is first deprecated as impious, and then refuted as absurd.

*How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?*] Read, "**We that died to sin, how shall we** *live any longer therein?*" The relative clause, placed first for the sake of emphasis, gives a characteristic definition of believers, which shows the absurdity of supposing that they are to "*continue in sin.*"

The aorist, too, must be properly rendered: "**we that died to sin,**" not "*we that are dead;*" for it is a mere truism to say that to live in sin is inconsistent with a continued and present deadness to its influence, and what the Apostle means is that to *live* in sin is inconsistent with *having once died* to it. To have shared Christ's death, in the moral sense, is the sure prelude to sharing His new life. The question "*How?*" implies here not a physical impossibility, but a moral contradiction.

To *live in sin* means more than to "*continue in sin:*" it is to have sin for the element in which we live, the moral atmosphere which our souls breathe.

The expression "dying unto sin" is first found in this passage, though St. Paul in an earlier epistle speaks of "dying to the law" (Gal. ii. 19; vi. 14; Rom. vii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 24.) It means to be released from all power and influence of sin, as a slave is by death released from the power of his master: see note on *v.* 7.

Lest the phrase "*died to sin*" should seem strange and unintelligible, the Apostle checks himself and explains it; yet even in his mode of doing this he implies that his readers ought not to need an explanation.

Digitized by Google

3 Know ye not, that so many of us as [1]were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

[1] Or, *are.*

4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

---

3. *Know ye not*] "**Or** *know ye not.*" The word "**or**" points to the only alternative: if they do not understand what it is to "*have died to sin,*" they must be ignorant of the meaning and effect of their baptism; and the very thought of such ignorance gives a tone of reproof to the question.

Here (as in *v.* 11), instead of "*Jesus Christ,*" the right order is "**Christ Jesus;**" the Mediatorial name holds the emphatic position here, and is used alone in the following context (*vv.* 4, 8, 9), because He into whom we are baptized is the head, with whom all the members are united in one body.

To be "*baptized into Christ*" is to be brought by baptism into union with Him: but the original word represents this union in a vivid picture, which we can only reproduce by using some less familiar word,—"immersed *into Christ,*" "immersed *into his death.*" So the Israelites are said figuratively to have been "*all baptized unto* (**into**) *Moses in the cloud and in the sea*" (1 Cor. x. 2), because the result of their passing under the cloud and through the waters was that "they believed the Lord and his servant Moses" (Ex. xiv. 31), and were thus united with Moses as their deliverer whom they trusted, their leader whom they followed, and their mediator in whose covenant they shared. Compare also 1 Cor. xii. 13, and Gal. iii. 27, in which passages, as here, the union with Christ in baptism is expressly ascribed to all who are baptized, because it is a gift of God bestowed freely on all, though from its very nature dependent on a right use for its continued efficacy.

Christ's death, burial, and resurrection being necessary steps in the process by which He unites us to Himself in a new life, to be "*baptized into Christ*" is to be brought into union with His death (*v.* 3), His burial (*v.* 4), His resurrection (*v.* 5).

*baptized into his death.*] The union with Christ into which we enter by baptism is thus more closely defined first as union with His death; but the death of Christ has various aspects, and the context must determine in which of these it is presented. This is clearly stated in *v.* 10: "*in that he died, he died unto sin once.*" His death is here viewed as the final and complete deliverance from a life in which for our sakes He had been subject to conditions imposed by our sins; and this sense exactly corresponds with the thought which led to the mention of Christ's death, "*How shall we that* **died** *to sin, live any longer therein?*"

Thus the moral character of the whole life of faith is determined in the very act by which man enters into that life.

4. *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.*] "**We were buried therefore with him by our baptism into his death.**" Assuming his readers' assent to the fact that "we were baptized into Christ's death," St. Paul proceeds to state (1) its immediate consequence, *we* **were** *buried with him,*" and (2) its final purpose, that we might be, like Him, raised up to a new life.

The expression, "**we were buried,**" may have been suggested by the momentary burial beneath the baptismal water (see Bingham, 'Antiq.' XI. xi. § 4): it declares in the strongest manner our union with Christ in death, and our entire separation from the former life in which sin reigned. But burial, being a sign and seal which attests the reality of death, serves also to attest the reality of the resurrection: hence the significance which St. Paul attaches to Christ's burial, and to our baptismal burial with Him; compare Col. ii. 12: "*buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.*"

*Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father.*] "*Glory*" is the manifestation of excellence, and "*the glory of the Father*" includes all the excellence of Deity that can be manifested: it is a more comprehensive attribute than "power," which is the kind of excellence especially manifested in the resurrection (ch. i. 4; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Eph. i. 19).

Compare our Lord's words concerning the resurrection of Lazarus: "*Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?*" (John xi. 40).

"*Christ was raised by the glory of the Father,* not as lacking strength Himself, for He is the Lord of all powers, but because both Christ and His Apostles ascribe what is above man's nature to the glory of the supreme nature" (Cyril in Cramer's 'Catena'). So Pearson shows with admirable force that "the raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father, but is not attributed to the Father alone." See 'Exposition of the Creed,' i. 301–304, and note on viii. 11.

By "*newness of life*" is meant "newness" of

Digitized by Google

5 For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection :

---

the element of life, of the living animating principle, not the life that is lived day by day (*βίος*), but the life which liveth in us (*ζωή*).

On this most important distinction, see Trench, 'N. T. Syn.,' 2nd series, and the comment of Theodorus in Cramer's 'Catena' on this passage, that "we ought to exhibit the conduct proper to that life (*ἐνδείκνυσθαι τὸν βίον τῆς ζωῆς ἐκείνης*) into which we believe that we have been born through our baptism." The conduct of life (*βίος*) is here expressed by the figure of "*walking*," as in the similar passage Gal. v. 25. Compare also Eph. v. 2, "*walk in love*," and Col. iv. 5, "*walk in wisdom*." The life in Christ is a new life, and this quality is made prominent by the substantival form, "*newness of life*": compare ch. vii. 6; and 1 Tim. vi. 17: Winer, 'Gr.,' § xxxiv. 2.

The "*life*" imparted, as is shown in *v.* 5, is that of the risen Christ in His glorified humanity, of which the Apostle writes to the Colossians (ch. iii. 3, 4), "*Ye are dead* (**Ye died**), *and your life is* (**has been**) *hidden with Christ in God*. When *Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory*."

For an admirable comment on the doctrine of the passage, see Hooker, 'E. P.' Bk.V. ch. lvi. § 6. "The sons of God have God's own natural Son as a second Adam from heaven, whose race and progeny they are by spiritual and heavenly birth." § 7. "God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And his Church he frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man. His body crucified and His blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elements of that heavenly being which maketh us such as Himself is of whom we come."—*Ib.* "Adam is in us as an original cause of our nature, and of that corruption of nature which causes death; Christ as the cause original of restoration to life. . . . Christ having Adam's nature, as we have, but incorrupt, deriveth not nature but incorruption, and that immediately from His own person unto all that belong unto Him."

It will be seen in c. viii. 2, 9–11, that this new vital element is "*the Spirit of life*." In this world the "*life*" itself is hidden, but its effects are to be seen in our "*walking after the Spirit*" (viii. 4).

5. *For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death.*] "*For if we have* **become united to** *the likeness of his death.*"

The death and resurrection of Christ's natural body have their corresponding effects in His mystical body "the blessed company of all faithful people." *The likeness of his death*" is their "death unto sin," and "*the likeness of his resurrection*" is their "new birth unto righteousness." These are both included in Baptism, by which the believer has been brought into living union with Christ's mystical body, has become one by birth and growth (*σύμφυτος*) with it and with its essential properties, "the *likeness of his death*" and "*the likeness of his resurrection*."

Some interpretors give a different turn to the passages "if we have been united *with him* by the likeness of his death." But this construction requires an arbitrary addition to St. Paul's words, which do not express, though they of course imply, a direct union of the believer with Christ Himself.

*we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.*] The A. V. gives the sense correctly, and it is hardly possible to express in English the lively turn of the Greek (*ἀλλὰ καί*): "Why then also of his resurrection we shall be."

"*The likeness of his resurrection*" is the "*newness of life*" imparted to us, as the gift of God, wrought by the same divine power which raised Christ from the dead. "Because the work of his Spirit to those effects" (sanctification and life) "is in us prevented by sin and death possessing us before, it is of necessity that as well our present sanctification unto newness of life, as the future restoration of our bodies should presuppose a participation of the grace, efficacy, merit, or virtue of his body and blood" (Hooker, 'E. P.' lib. v. c. lvi. § 10. "It is not required that we should die the death of the body as Christ did, but to die as Isaac did in the similitude and figure of his death; that is, we should die to sin . . . . And as it is not required that we should die the death of the body in Baptism; so it is not to be expected that we should be forthwith raised unto that glory, whereunto He rose, but to (*sic*) be raised unto a similitude or likeness of it, that is, unto newness of life, which is the first resurrection. And of this resurrection we shall not fail to be actual partakers by Baptism, if we be rightly implanted into the similitude of His death; for so the Apostle's words are" (Jackson, 'Creed,' xi. 17).

Thus the future ("*we shall be*") as in *v.* 2, is not to be understood of the future resurrection, but expresses that which is morally certain to take place as a consequence of having been united to Christ in his death (see also Alford).

Digitized by Google

6 Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

7 For he that is dead is [1]freed from sin.

8 Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him:

[1] Gr. *justified.*

---

6. *Knowing this.*] **Noting** *this.* The knowledge here meant (γινώσκοντες) is not knowledge of a *fact*, simply as a fact (εἰδότες *v.* 9), but of the *idea* involved in it, a knowledge which results from the exercise of the understanding (νοῦς).

The participle is closely connected with the preceding clause: our conformity to Christ's resurrection must spring from, or at least be attended by, a right perception of the idea and purpose of our union with His death, as stated in what follows.

*our old man is crucified with him.*] This is frequently interpreted as if the whole sinfulness of the unregenerate man, or the whole sinfulness of our common nature derived from Adam, were *personified* under the name of "*our old man.*" But such a figure of speech falls far short of the vivid and intense reality of St. Paul's thought. In Gal. ii. 20, a passage written only a few months before this, he says: "**I have been** *crucified with Christ:* **and it is no longer I that live,** *but Christ liveth in me.*" Contrasting his former with his present state, the Apostle feels that he is like another being, and has undergone a change as complete as that of death; his former self has passed way, he lives as a new man in Christ, and Christ in him. The "*old man*" is thus seen to be no abstraction or personification, it is our former self in the old corrupt and sinful condition: the figure lies in what follows.

*is crucified with him.*] "**Was** *crucified with him,*" namely in Baptism, as the whole context requires. If St. Paul's language seems exaggerated, it is because we who were baptized as unconscious infants can hardly realise what Baptism was to the adult believer in the Apostolic age.

"The recipient—thus has St. Paul figuratively represented the process—is conscious (*a*) in the baptism generally: "Now am I entering into fellowship with the death of Christ:" (*b*) in the immersion: "Now am I being buried with Christ:" (*c*) and then in the emergence: "Now I rise to the new life with Christ" (Meyer).

*that the body of sin might be destroyed.*] As it is not "the man" simply, but the "*old man*" that was crucified, so the purpose of that crucifixion was not that "the body" simply, but "*the body of sin*" might be destroyed.

This is the body of the old man that was crucified, that is to say, it is the natural body in its old condition, as the servant of sin.

This relation of servitude is distinctly expressed in the following words, "**that we should no longer serve sin,**" and is fully developed in *vv.* 12–14, where nothing else than the natural body, and its members can possibly be meant. That which in Col. ii. 11 is called "*the body of the flesh,*" because of the allusion to circumcision, is here called "*the body of sin,*" because of the reference in this context to sin as a power reigning in the body (v. 21; vi. 1, 2, 12 ff.).

*might be destroyed.*] The body is to be destroyed, not in its material substance, but in its relation to sin: it is to be rendered as thoroughly inert, motionless, and dead, in relation to sin, as it is, by actual crucifixion, in relation to an earthly master. According to our Saviour's emphatic language, the right eye is to be plucked out, and the right hand cut off from the service of sin.

7. *For he that is dead is freed from sin.*] In ver. 6, as in John viii. 34, the sinner is regarded as a servant or slave, who is crucified and dies with Christ, in order that he may no longer be enslaved to sin. This view of the believer's relation to sin is now confirmed by the general maxim that death puts an end to all bondage, and slaves

> "once ferried o'er the wave
> That parts us, are emancipate and loos'd."
> (Cowper, 'The Task.')

The only difficulty of the verse is due to the brevity with which St. Paul compresses into one sentence the illustration taken from common life, and its application to our spiritual state. "As the slave when dead is set free from his master, so he that has died with Christ is freed from sin."

The word δεδικαίωται does not here mean "justified" in the dogmatic sense, but (as in Sirac. xxvi. 29: οὐ δικαιωθήσεται κάπηλος ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας), "released and emancipated from sin" (Cyril in Œcumenius); in Latin, "vindicatus in libertatem."

The context is full of this idea of emancipation from the slavery of sin (*vv.* 14, 17, 18, 22), and from the power of law (vii. 1–6): and both these ideas are found in like sequence in 1 Cor. vii. 21 and 29.

**8–14.** The Apostle now turns to a new

Digitized by Google

9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.
10 For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.
11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but

---

and peculiar feature of the case: the death, which delivers from the bondage of sin, is followed by a new life of liberty (*vv.* 8–11), which is not under sin's dominion, but is to be devoted to the service of a new master (*vv.* 12–14).

**8.** *Now if we be dead with Christ, &c.*] Read, "**But if we died with Christ,**" &c. Since Christ's death has been to Him the prelude to a new life, we who have shared His death believe rightly that we are to share His life also.

That the life here spoken of is a gift bestowed by Christ's grace, is well shown by Calvin on *v.* 10, "If he were only reminding us of a duty, his mode of speaking would have been this: 'Since we have died with Christ, we ought in like manner to live with Him.' But the word '*believe*' shows that he is discussing a doctrine of faith, founded upon promises, as if he had said, "Believers ought to hold it certain that by Christ's gift of grace (beneficio), they have so died according to the flesh, that the same Christ maintains the 'newness of life' even unto the end.'"

The future, "*we shall live,*" is not to be limited to the final resurrection, but shows what will necessarily follow, after our participation in Christ's death.

**9.** *Knowing, &c.*] Our belief that we shall live with Christ rests on our knowledge of the fact (εἰδότες), that He is alive for evermore; we could have no assurance that we shall live with Him, unless we knew that He can never cease to live. Therefore St. Paul repeats the same important truth still more emphatically: "*death hath no more dominion*" (literally, "is no longer master") "*over him.*" Others who had been raised from the dead returned to that common life of men, in which death still had dominion over them; but with Christ it was not so; "Do not think, because He died once, that He is mortal; for this very reason He abideth immortal. For His death has become the death of Death; and because He died, therefore He dieth no more; for even that death He died unto sin." (Chrysost.)

**10.** *he died unto sin once*] Christ was subjected for our sake to the power of sin, in so far that He endured all the evils that sin could inflict on one "*who did no sin.*" This tyranny of sin (not His own, but ours) was permitted, through the counsel of God and Christ's willing obedience, to compass His death: "*He humbled himself and became obedient unto death*" (Phil. ii. 8).

But there sin's power over Him ceased, because the purpose, for which it was permitted, was accomplished. The sin of man, now that it has cost Him His life, can have no more power over Him: He died once for all "*unto sin,*" i.e. His previous *relation to sin* came utterly to an end, He was withdrawn for ever from the power of sin, and therefore from the power of death. There are thus three points to be observed in Christ's relation to sin:

(1) His life, as a conflict with, and a triumph over, sin, making Him as man personally exempt from death.

(2) His voluntary surrender, for the sins of the world, of a life not forfeited by sin of His own.

(3) The effect of this voluntary submission to the chastisement of our sins, viz. His final separation from sin and death. Compare Hebrews vii. 27; ix. 25–28.

*but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.*] Christ's earthly life was not *exclusively* a life unto God, but had also a certain relation of subjection to sin; but now the heavenly life "*he liveth unto God,*" wholly and exclusively. In Him the manhood taken into God, and perfected by suffering, lives only for its true end, "the glory of God." It can, therefore, be no more subject to the usurped tyranny of sin and death: He "*dieth no more*" (*v.* 9).

We should remember that in the words, "*he liveth,*" we have the testimony of one who had seen the Lord. In the light that shone round Him by Damascus, he had recognised first a Divine presence, "*Who art thou, Lord?*" and then came the astounding discovery that this living Lord was the persecuted Jesus, which liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore.

**11.** *dead indeed unto sin.*] The word "*dead*" (νεκρούς) here describes a continued state of death: as Christ died once for all unto sin, so the believer, once united to Christ, must regard himself as dead to the dominion of sin for ever.

*but alive unto God.*] The believer's new life belongs wholly to God, and must be devoted entirely to His service: like Christ, whose life he shares, "*he liveth unto God*" (*v.* 10), a life, which beginning on earth in holiness, shall continue in heaven in glory and honour and immortality.



Digitized by Google

alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.

13 Neither yield ye your members *as* [1]instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members *as* instruments of righteousness unto God.

14 For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.

[1] Gr. *arms, or, weapons.*

---

*through Jesus Christ our Lord.*] Read, "**in Christ Jesus.**" Conformity to the likeness both of Christ's death unto sin, and of His life unto God, is to be attained not merely "*through*," but "in," Christ Jesus. It is the proper effect of "*baptism into his death*" (*v.* 4), but an effect which can only be accomplished in those who realise and appropriate the grace bestowed on them; *i. e.* who believe and account themselves to be dead unto sin, and alive unto God in Christ Jesus.

**12, 13.** The exhortation now advances from faith to practice: let your conduct prove that you really are such as you reckon yourselves to be, and that both negatively and positively.

*Let not sin therefore reign.*] Let it no more have dominion; for we died with Christ that we should no longer be sin's slaves. "Being called to reign with Christ, it is absurd to choose to become the captives of sin; as if one should cast off the crown from his head, and wish to be a slave to some demoniac beggar-woman clothed in rags." (Chrysostom.)

*in your mortal body.*] The Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead, shall hereafter quicken also your mortal body; but as yet there is in its mortality a remnant or token of past bondage, and you are waiting for its redemption. Compare viii. 11, 23.

*mortal body.*] The only death from which Christ has *not* redeemed us, is the death—for a time—of the body; and the fact that the death of the body is still endured by man himself, gives more certainty and prominence to the truth that the death which we have *already* died in Christ is a death to the power of sin—a moral and sacramental death, which enfranchises our whole nature, body and soul, from sin's dominion. For though *death still reigns* over the mortal body, the sting of death—which is *sin—has ceased to reign,* except through our own fault.

*that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.*] Read, with the oldest MSS., "*that ye should obey* **the lusts thereof,**" *i.e.* of the body. Lusts of the body there will be: for though the higher part of man—his spirit—is in Christ's members already alive unto God (viii. 10), the body is still subject to death, and still exposed to the attacks of sin. See then that sin *reign* not in this mortal part, lest it should extend its usurpation thence to the immortal.

**13.** *Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin.*] Sin fights for the mastery; it calls out an army of the lusts of the body, and seeks to use the members, hand, eye, or tongue, as weapons wherewith the lusts may re-establish the rule of unrighteousness. "*Instruments*" (ὅπλα) mean weapons of war (John xviii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 4, &c.).

*but yield yourselves unto God.*] The Greek tense is changed: "Do not go on putting your members at sin's disposal, but once for all present (xii. 1) yourselves, both body and soul, unto God."

*as those that are alive from the dead.*] A slight omission of superfluous words shows the connexion more clearly: "*yield yourselves unto God* **as alive from the dead,**" *i. e.* as men raised to new life in Christ. See Note at end.

*and your members, &c.*] As in the prohibition, so here again in the positive exhortation, the more general thought is followed by the more special: yield yourselves to God, and yield your members as weapons of righteousness unto God.

**14.** *For sin shall not have dominion over you.*] The exhortation is confirmed by a promise: "Be not discouraged by your own weakness from giving yourselves up to God's service: your effort shall not fail, 'for sin shall not be master over you.' Sin will tempt and harass and ensnare, it will still be a powerful, dangerous, and too often victorious, enemy: but it shall have no authority over you; it shall not be your lord and master, disposing of you at will, and, as it were, of right" (vi. 9; vii. 1; xiv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 15).

*for ye are not under the law.*] "**under law.**" As the principle of a covenant of works, law is the strength of sin (1 Cor. xv. 56), and the occasion of its getting the mastery. But you have another Master, who rules not by law, but by grace. Christ Himself was "*made under* **law,**" in order that by His perfect obedience and atoning death, "*he*

Digitized by Google

15 What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.

16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

17 But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine [1]which was delivered you.

18 Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.

[1] Gr. *whereto ye were delivered.*

---

*might redeem them that were under* **law**, *that we might receive the adoption of sons*" (Gal. iv. 5). In other words, "that we might be brought '*under grace*,' and so being freely pardoned, justified, quickened in Christ, and made one with Him, might be no longer servants of sin, but sons of God."

**15.** *What then?*] Are we to turn the grace of our God into lasciviousness (Jude 4)? Are we to sin in hope of impunity, "*because we are not under* **law**, *but under grace?*" "*God forbid.*"

**16.** The suggestion indignantly rejected in *v.* 15, is now refuted by an appeal to truths which cannot be unknown to the reader; first, that he who habitually yields himself up to a slavish obedience, is in fact the slave of him whom he obeys (John viii. 34); and, further, that "*no man can serve two masters,*" but must be the servant "**either** *of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness.*" Observe that St. Paul puts the only two alternatives into the sharpest opposition by the aid of particles (ἤτοι, ἤ), which are found nowhere else in the New Testament (see Donaldson's 'Gr. Gr. § 552).

The end, unto which the servant of sin is brought, is "*death:*" not here bodily death, for that is a result of Adam's sin, from which not even the servants of God are exempt, nor merely moral death, which is sin itself, but eternal death. Compare *vv.* 21–23.

"*Obedience*" is used first in a general sense, but is limited the second time to the special sense of "obedience to God," and the end of such obedience is that "*righteousness,*" which is equivalent to life eternal (i. 17) and so stands opposed to "*death.*"

**17.** The general truth stated in *v.* 16, is now applied to the Christians at Rome in their past and present state, the happy contrast being vividly expressed in a burst of thanksgiving to God: "ardor pectoris apostolici" (Bengel.)

Both the thought and form of expression are similar to Luke xv. 23, "let us eat and be merry, for this my son was dead, and is alive again." Compare Matt. xi. 25, and see Note at end of chapter.

*but ye have obeyed.*] "**but obeyed.**" This simpler and more exact rendering brings the latter clause into closer connexion with the former, to which it allows its due emphasis. "Thanks be to God for your happy change of service: ye were servants of sin, but became obedient to the Gospel."

St. Paul's thankfulness that they became God's servants, is heightened by the remembrance that they *were* servants of sin.

*from the heart.*] "For ye were not compelled nor forced, but willingly, and with eagerness turned away from sin." This serves at once for praise and for reproof; for, after coming of your own accord, without any compulsion, what forgiveness, what excuse, could you get, for returning to your former state?" (Chrysostom.)

*that form of doctrine which was delivered you.*] "*that form of doctrine* **unto which ye were delivered,**" *i.e.* by God.

The word παραδίδωμι is not uncommonly used of giving a child over to instruction. (Herodot. i. 73; Plat. 'Legg.' 811 E.)

"*the form of doctrine*" means, in general, the teaching to which the Romans had been given over by Divine Providence on becoming Christians. But the word "*form*" (τύπος) has been variously interpreted:

(1) Christian teaching as "a *mould* into which we are put to be fashioned to its shape." (Beza.)

(2) The Pauline "type of doctrine" (ii. 16; xvi. 25; Gal. ii. 2), which had been prevalent from the first at Rome. (Meyer.)

(3) The Gospel as a definite form of teaching distinct from others, Jewish, heathen, &c.

(4) "*The form of sound words*" (2 Tim. i. 13), or fixed and formal summary of Christian truth in which converts were instructed.

(5) Christian teaching as a rule or pattern of holy living. (Chrysostom, Gennadius, Œcumenius.)

The last sense is the simplest, and agrees best with St. Paul's use of τύπος (1 Thess. i. 7; 2 Thess. iii. 9; Phil. iii. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7), and with the context, which indicates obedience to moral and practical rules.

**18.** *Being then made free from sin.*] "**And**



Digitized by Google

19 I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness.

20 For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free [1]from righteousness.

21 What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things *is* death.

[1] Gr. *to righteousness.*

---

**being made free, &c."** This is not a conclusion drawn from *vv.* 16, 17, but a more precise and pointed statement of the happy change already asserted in *v.* 17.

**19.** *I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh.*] The weakness of the flesh is not identical with its sinfulness, for even Christ shared all its weakness. But that which in Him was subject to His Spirit, and free from all sin, in us sinful men not only resists our spirit, but too often prevails over it, and that in two ways, both darkening the understanding and perverting the will. The meaning of the present passage depends on the question, which of these two effects, the moral or the intellectual, is here ascribed to "*the infirmity of the flesh.*"

(1) The ancient interpreters, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, connect this clause with what follows, and understand "*the infirmity of the flesh*" as a *moral* weakness which makes it hard at first to live the life of Christian holiness: "I say what is moderate and within the power of men in general (ἀνθρώπινον, 1 Cor. x. 13): for I only bid you render such an obedience to righteousness as you formerly gave to sin."

(2) Photius, who is followed by most modern commentators, connects the clause with *v.* 18, as explaining the strong expression, "ye were made slaves" (ἐδουλώθητε): "this is plain language taken from the common life of men, and not altogether an adequate description of your allegiance to Him 'Whose service is perfect freedom:' but I use it '*because of the infirmity of your flesh*' (*a*), which makes the life of righteousness seem to you at first painful and irksome, as a kind of bondage (Photius), or (*b*), which is a hindrance to your spiritual discernment. I therefore speak of 'servitude' (*vv.* 16–18), a thing belonging to the common life of men, to help you to understand that you are bound to devote yourselves entirely to God's service." In this last interpretation, (which is rightly adopted by Bengel, Meyer, &c.) "*the flesh*," *i.e.* the condition of the natural man (1 Cor. ii. 14; iii. 1) is the source of a weakness of *understanding* in things spiritual.

On "*the flesh*," see note on vii. 5.

*for as ye have yielded* (**ye yielded**) *your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity.*] The practical reason of my speaking about servitude is this, to exhort you to devote yourselves as fully to the life of righteousness as you did to the life of sin.

*your members.*] Compare *v.* 13. Sin is here presented under a double aspect, as "*uncleanness*" defiling the man, and "*iniquity*" (ἀνομία) violating God's law: the subjection of the members to these ruling forces leads "*unto iniquity*" as the practical result.

*unto holiness.*] "*unto* **sanctification.**" "Holiness" is the moral quality to be acquired: but "**sanctification**" (ἁγιασμός) includes the sanctifying act or process, as well as its result; see *v.* 22; 1 Cor. i. 30; 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Tim. ii. 15; Heb. xii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 2.

**20–22.** Reason (γάρ) for the exhortation of *v.* 19, drawn from the results of either service.

**20.** *For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.*] "*For when ye were* **servants of sin,** *ye were free* **of righteousness:**" *i.e.* free in relation to, free from the service of righteousness. No irony, but a statement of fact, full of deep moral pain (Meyer). You did not then attempt to serve two masters (comp. *v.* 16), but gave yourselves wholly to the service of sin. What then was the result (*v.* 21)? We thus see that *v.* 20 prepares the way for what follows (Meyer).

**21.** *What fruit had ye then . . . .* ] "*What fruit* **therefore** *had ye then*" . . . . "**Therefore,**" *i.e.* in consequence of this undivided service of sin (*v.* 20).

*in those things whereof ye are now ashamed.*] We find even in the earliest versions and commentators different ways of connecting this clause with the context.

1. According to A. V., St. Paul asks "what fruit," *i.e.* what profit or reward had you at that time, from things done in the service of sin, at the very thought of which you are now ashamed? You had none: for the end of those things is death. Sin pays no other wages (*v.* 23), and sin's service has no other fruit.

2. The question is simply, "what fruit had ye at that time?" and the answer, "Things whereof ye are now ashamed, for the end of

Digitized by Google

22 But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

23 For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

---

them is death." Your only fruit consisted in the sinful gains or pleasures, of which you are now ashamed. because you have become aware of their real nature, that they lead to that death which is the opposite of "*everlasting life*" (*v.* 22).

Either interpretation yields a good sense, but the former construction is the more natural and simple.

22. *But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God.*] A double contrast to their former state described in *v.* 20: emancipated from sin's service, they have been **made** servants to God. The same strong word as in *v.* 18 (δουλωθῆναι) is used again: but instead of servants "*to righteousness*," he now says "*servants to God*," thinking already of Him as the Giver of everlasting life.

*ye have your fruit unto holiness.*] "*Unto* **sanctification**:" see note on ἁγιασμός, *v.* 19. The first fruit of dedication to God's service is not here described as "sanctification," but as something that tends "**unto sanctification**." This is either the baptismal grace of "newness of life" (*v.* 4), or its product, that practice of good works which promotes and establishes "sanctification." Compare "*the fruit of the Spirit*," Gal. v. 22.

*and the end everlasting life.*] You have your present fruit unto sanctification, and you have also as the end of your service "*everlasting life*:" see on ii. 7, v. 21. It is clear that "*everlasting life*" being here called "*the end*" is regarded in its future aspect: and yet St. Paul says, "ye have it" now, *i.e.* ye have it as a future, but assured result, the consummation of your present life in Christ.

23. *For the wages of sin is death.*] "*Wages*" (ὀψώνια) properly, as in Luke iii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 8, a soldier's rations or pay. Having spoken in *vv.* 12, 13, of sin reigning, and of weapons, he continues the figure of military service. But χάρισμα means simply "a gift of grace," not a military donative (Tert. 'de Resurrectione Carnis,' 47; Chrys.).

*but the gift of God.*] Sin only pays hard wages, but God gives of His free grace what no service could earn.

*eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*] "*eternal life* **in Christ Jesus** *our Lord.*" God's gift of eternal life is not only bestowed *through* Christ, but is *in* Christ as its abiding source, and can only be enjoyed in union with Him (see 2 Tim. i. 1, 9, and Note on viii. 1).

The doctrine of sanctification in this chapter, and that of justification in ch. v., both end in the same triumphant conclusion.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 5, 6, 13, 17, 21.

5. Σύμφυτος—*born together*, Plato, 'Theaet.' p. 157; 'Republ.' X. p. 609, A; 3 Macc. iii. 22; —*cognate*, *kindred*, Plato, 'Leges,' x. p. 207.

6. *the body of sin.*] The interpretations are manifold.

1. "The whole mass of sin." But σῶμα in the sense of "mass" is applied only to material things, as water or metal (Aristot. Probl. xxiii. 7, § 1, xxiv. 9, § 3), not to things immaterial, as virtue or vice.

2. "The essence, or substance, of sin" (Baur), as Aristotle calls the Enthymeme the σῶμα, or substance of rhetorical proof ('Rhet.' I. 1. § 3).

3. A mere periphrasis for "sin" (Photius, Schöttgen, &c). But in this usage σῶμα is applied only to persons and only in poetry. None of these three senses suit the context or St. Paul's usage.

4. "Sin represented as having a body," in order to carry out the metaphor of the crucifixion of the old man (Olshausen).

5. "Sin represented as a body made up of many members," in accordance with the figurative interpretation of "the old man" (*v.* 6), and with Col. iii. 5 (but see note there). In this interpretation, "*the body of sin*" is only another name for "*the old man*," or rather for its concrete form" (Hodge: so Chrysostom, Philippi, &c.).

6. In opposition to all these figurative interpretations we take "*the body of sin*" to mean the natural body so far as it is the servant of sin (Meyer, De Wette, Alford).

*Objection* (*a*): *The body as the seat of sin* cannot be meant, because this can only be annihilated (καταργηθῇ) by natural death.

*Answer* (1). This objection does not apply to "the body as *servant* of sin," which is here St. Paul's view as shown by μηκέτι δουλεύειν.

*Answer* (2). The sense assigned to κα-

Digitized by Google

ταργηθῇ "annihilated" is forced, its true meaning being explained by τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν.

*Objection* (*b*). The following σῶμα θνητόν in *v.* 12, cannot determine the meaning of σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, being found in a different connection.

*Answer.* It is found in precisely the same connection, the *service of sin.*

**13.** The various reading—ὡσεὶ for ὡς—adopted by Tisch. (8), Tregelles, Lachmann, &c., with ℵ A B C, is thus explained by Theodore of Mopsuestia (Cramer's Cat.): "The most marvellous thing is that he says, '*as if* alive from the dead,' shewing that he does not demand from them the reality, but the imitation, according to their power. For hereafter they will be "alive from the dead;" but now he says, "as (ὡς) alive from the dead," instead of "imitating that as much as possible."

The variation might easily arise from the scribe repeating part of the following ἐκ.

**17.** Reiche, Fritzsche, Meyer, and others limit the cause of thanksgiving to the words ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, to which they ascribe the pregnant sense, "ye were, but are no longer, the slaves of sin."

This use of the Substantive Verb is well-known in Latin:

'Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens Gloria.' (Verg. Æn. ii. 325.)

'Magnum manet Ardea nomen, Sed fortuna fuit.' (vii. 413.)

In Eurip. Troad. 582, πρίν ποτ' ἦμεν and Hec. 284, κἀγὼ γὰρ ἦν ποτ' ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἴμ' ἔτι, the cessation of a former state is expressed not by ἦν, but by the words which accompany it: and the same is true of this passage, and Eph. v. 8, ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, where the antithetical connection of the clauses is perfectly clear, and the insertion of μέν is quite unnecessary, the more so on account of the emphatic position of ἦτε. See Jelf, 'Gr. Gr.' § 767, 3, and Winer, ii. 652, E. T.

**21.** Καρπὸν ἔχειν may mean to bear fruit, as in *v. l.*, Nah. iii. 12, συκαῖ καρποὺς ἔχουσαι, Gen. i. 29, ξύλον ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ καρπόν, and perhaps Sap. iii. 1, ἕξει καρπὸν ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ ψυχῶν.

But this meaning cannot be forced (as by Alford) on St. Paul's use of the expression in i. 13, vi. 21, 22. That καρπός does not always mean in N. T. "*actions*, the fruit of the man considered as the tree," but the fruit of his actions, is clear from Phil. i. 22, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

1 *No law hath power over a man longer than he liveth.* 4 *But we are dead to the law.* 7 *Yet is not the law sin,* 12 *but holy, just, good,* 16 *as I acknowledge, who am grieved because I cannot keep it.*

KNOW ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband.

---

CHAP. VII.—DELIVERANCE FROM THE BONDAGE OF LAW AND OF SIN.

**1–6.** The union of the believer with Christ is compared to a second marriage. This general idea naturally divides itself into three parts: (1) the dissolution of the former marriage; (2) the new marriage; (3) its fruits.

The believer, released from the law by dying in fellowship with the death of Christ, is free to enter into a new union with the risen Christ, in order to bring forth the fruits of holiness to God's honour.

**1.** *Know ye not.*] Rather, **Or are ye ignorant,** *brethren,* **for I am speaking to men that know law.** On the meaning of "*know*," *i. e.* understand (γινώσκουσιν), see note on vi. 6. "**Or,**" omitted in A. V. here, as in vi. 3, introduces a necessary alternative: either you admit the truth of my assertion, that you are no longer under the law (vi. 14 ff.), but have been set free from sin and become servants to God having your fruit unto holiness (vi. 22), or else you must be ignorant of what I suppose you to know, the nature of law, namely, that the law has power over the person subject to it for his lifetime, and no longer. This principle is not confined to the Mosaic law, either in fact or by the terms here used; yet it is clear, from the whole tenor of the argument, that St. Paul is thinking of the Mosaic law, and assumes that it is known to his readers. Compare Gal. iv. 21.

**2.** The law of marriage affords the most complete and striking illustration of the general principle that the power of law lasts as long as life lasts, and no longer; it

Digitized by Google

3 So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be

---

also serves to introduce the comparison, in *v.* 4, of the union between Christ and the believer to a new marriage.

*is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth.*] Rather, **Is bound to the living husband by law** (see 1 Cor. vii. 39).

*loosed.*] "**Discharged:**" it is most important to mark the identity of the word (κατήργηται) here rendered "*loosed*," and in *v.* 6 "*delivered;*" it is found also in Gal. v. 4, where it is vigorously rendered by Wyclif: "ye are voided away from Christ." On the death of her husband the wife ceases to be a wife; her status as such is abolished and annulled, in the eye of the law; she dies to the law, and is thus **discharged** from its prohibition of another marriage.

"*The law of* **the husband**" means the law concerning the husband. Particular laws are constantly thus defined by the genitive of the person or thing to which they refer, as "*the law of the leper*" (Lev. xiv. 2), "*the law of the Nazarite*" (Num. vi. 13). See also Num. v. 29, where the LXX have the same Greek words which St. Paul uses here to describe the wife (ὕπανδρος γυνή).

Thus "*the law of* **the husband**," includes all that the law of God, as revealed in the O. T., sanctions or forbids concerning marriage; its natural basis is the original Divine institution (Gen. i. 27; ii. 21–24); its formal enactment is the Seventh Commandment; its interpretation the written, or unwritten, regulations concerning adultery (Lev. x. 10), divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1; Matt. v. 27–32; xix. 3–9), and remarriage (Deut. xxiv. 4; Gen. xxv. 1; Ruth i. 9).

3. *So then if, &c.*] Rather, *So then* **while her husband liveth she shall be called an adulteress if she be married to another man:** *but if her husband* **die,** *she is free from* **the law, that she be** *no adulteress, though she be married to another man.* In this order, the parallelism of the original is clearly seen, and each clause has its due emphasis. The words "**that she be** *no adulteress*" express not merely the result, but *the purpose*, of the freedom consequent upon the husband's death; and this *purpose* is the most essential and significant part of the analogy, as we see in the application (*v.* 4), "*that ye should be married to another.*"

4. *Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead.*] Rather, **So that,** *my brethren, ye also* **were put to death** *to the law* **through** *the body of Christ*, **in order that ye might** *be married to another.*

"**So that**" (ὥστε) introduces a consequence of that general principle of law, which has just been exemplified in *vv.* 1–3.

The address "*my brethren*," repeated so soon after *v.* 1, is suited to an argument which primarily concerns the Jewish Christians, St. Paul's brethren according to the flesh.

"*Ye also*" means "ye as well as the wife in the illustration."

The phrase "**were put to death**" (ἐθανατώθητε) indicates a violent death, namely the crucifixion of *the old man with Christ* (vi. 6) for thereby the believer himself died to the law, by which he was previously bound. Compare Gal. ii. 19, "*I through* **law** *died to* **law**, *that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.*"

St. Paul's application of the figure is quite clear, if we follow his own guidance.

The wife represents that inmost self, or personality, which survives all changes, moral or physical, and retains its identity under all conditions of existence.

The first husband is "*our old man*" (vi. 6), and as long as "*the old man*" was alive, we were under the law.

The death of the first husband is the crucifixion of "*our old man*" with Christ. The wife set free by her husband's death, and herself made dead to the law of the husband (κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός, *v.* 2), answers to the soul set free by the crucifixion of "*the old man*," and itself thereby made dead to the law (ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ, *v.* 4; and κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, *v.* 6).

The purpose of the freedom thus acquired is the same in your case, as in hers, "**that ye might** *be married to another*, **to him who was raised** *from the dead.*"

The interpretation of the passage thus turns upon the recognition of the fact, that St. Paul here already introduces a distinction (which we shall find running through the whole chapter), between *the very self*, the αὐτὸς ἐγώ, and its successive moral states,

Digitized by Google

married to another, *even* to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

5 For when we were in the flesh, the [1]motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.

6 But now we are delivered from the law, [1]that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve

[1] Gr. *passions.*

[1] Or *being dead to that.*

personified as "*the old man*," and "*the new man.*"

The words, "**through the body of Christ,**" do not refer to His mystical body, with which we are incorporated, but to the natural body, which was put to death upon the Cross; into that death of Christ we are baptized, and thereby it becomes the means of our death "*to the law.*" Compare note on *v.* 5, and Col. ii. 14, 20.

This participation in Christ's death has been fully established, and its significance explained, in c. vi. Here, as there, the union in death becomes the source of union in the new life of the risen Christ. The best comment is 2 Cor. v. 14, 15: "*If one died for all, then all* **died**: *and he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.*"

*that ye should be married to another.*] The A.V. "*be married*" is quite correct: for in the passages usually cited from the LXX (Lev. xxii. 12, 13; Ruth i. 12; Ezek. xxiii. 4) the phrase γίγνεσθαι ἀνδρί is applied to marriage, not to promiscuous intercourse. Here also the context limits the meaning to marriage; and the comparison of the union between Christ and the believer to a marriage is familiar to St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 25, 29).

The purpose of this "spiritual marriage, and unity betwixt Christ and His Church," (and consequently the final purpose of our release from the law), is "*that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*" It is to God's honour, as our Creator, Redeemer, and Lord, that souls wedded to Christ should not remain barren, but be fruitful in good works, in holiness and love.

**5.** The necessity for the new marriage confirmed by contrasting its fruits with those of the former union.

*When we were in the flesh*] The word "*flesh*" is used by St. Paul with many different shades of meaning, which are classified in the note on the word σάρξ in the Introduction, § 9. Here as a state in which believers once lived, but live no longer, "*the flesh*" is regarded, not in its physical but in its ethical quality as opposed to "*the spirit*," and that, not only as the seat of moral weakness and temptation, to which believers are still subject, but as the sphere of dominant sinful affections to which believers have died in Christ. "*When we were in the flesh*" is thus equivalent to, "when we were united to our old man," or, "when we were in the body of sin:" compare vi. 6.

*the motions of sins.*] Margin, "the passions of sins" *i.e.* the passive impressions or "**affections**" (Gal. v. 24), which are naturally excited by their proper objects, and if unrestrained move us to sinful actions: see Butler's 'Analogy,' P. I. c. 5, p. 122.

*which were by the law.*] So long as "*we were in the flesh*," united to "*our old man*," the law had dominion over us (*v.* 1). How the sinful passions are occasioned by the law, St. Paul explains in *vv.* 7, 8.

*did work in our members*] The passive affections of the soul become in their turn motives working on the will, and through it in the members (eye, hand, tongue, &c.), "*to bring forth fruit unto death*," *i.e.* to cause *us* so to act as to subject ourselves to the power of death, death being understood as in vi. 21. Others compare Jas. i. 15, and make the sinful affections themselves bear fruit. See the Additional Note on the word ἐνηργεῖτο at the end of the chapter.

**6.** *But now we are delivered from the law.*] Rather: **But now we have been discharged** *from the law:* the Greek word being the same as in *v.* 2, "*She is loosed* (**discharged**) *from the law of her husband.*"

*that being dead, wherein we were held.*] Rather: **by dying to that** *wherein we were held:* see note at the end.

When "our old man was crucified with Christ," we ourselves, like the wife in the figure, died to the law (*v.* 4), which had hitherto had dominion over us by virtue of the unhappy union between ourselves and our old sinful nature.

As the Apostle, in girding himself up to the great argument which is to follow (*vv.* 7–25), has shown in a remarkable allegory by what right and in what manner we are delivered from the dominion of the law, it was natural for him, when indicating here in *v.* 6 the exact thesis of this most important discussion, to declare, in language derived from the preceding allegory, not only the fact of our liberation from the bondage of the law, but also by what right and reason we are liberated, namely, "by having died to the law in which we were held" (Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.')

Digitized by Google

in newness of spirit, and not *in* the oldness of the letter.

7 What shall we say then? *Is* the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known [1]lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all

[1] Or, *concupiscence*

---

*that we should serve*] **So that we serve**: a statement of the actual result, as in vi. 22.

Believers serve God in a new state, the element of which is "spirit," *i.e.* the life and power imparted to them by the Holy Spirit: this "*newness of spirit*" is the direct and emphatic contrast (Obs. οὐ, not μή) to "**oldness of letter**," *i.e.* the old and obsolete state of bondage to the law regarded in its letter as demanding an obedience which it does not enable us to render. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 6.

This "**oldness of letter**" was necessarily a state productive of sin (*v.* 5); and this thought forms the point of connection for what follows in *v.* 7.

7–25. Influence of Law on the Conflict of Flesh and Spirit.

Laying aside allegory, St. Paul now enters upon a profound psychological analysis of the work of the law in the heart. This analysis is *based upon his own experience*, as indeed it must be in order to have any truth or value. The use of the first person singular is therefore no rhetorical form, no personification of the human race or of the Jewish people. It is Paul himself speaking of himself throughout: but of himself not as differing from other believers, but as an exemplar and type of what is common to all. He deals, not with what is accidental and peculiar, but with what is essential, so that his experience is recognised by every believer as his own.

The extreme views thus set aside are that (1) only St. Paul's individual experience, (2) only an ideal struggle, is here described. We retain all that is true in these opposite views, in saying either that St. Paul describes his own experience so far as it was essential and common to all, or that he describes the general experience so far as it had been realised in his own case.

**7.** *Is the law sin?*] Having implied in *v.* 5 that the law is an *occasion* of sin, St. Paul anticipates a thought that might naturally occur to the mind of a Jewish Christian: Is the law itself sinful? Is the sin, of which it is the occasion, inherent in its own nature? He makes the question more emphatic by using "*sin*" instead of "sinful:" see viii. 10, 2 Cor. v. 21.

***Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law.***] Rather, **Nay, sin I knew not, save through law: for of lust also I had no knowledge, if the law had not said, Thou shalt not lust.**

To the false notion just rejected, St. Paul now opposes his own experience of the real effect of the law, which is to expose sin in its true nature. The direct opposition is well expressed in A. V. by the emphatic "*Nay.*" Compare iii. 31, vii. 13, xi. 11, in all which passages, as here, ἀλλά introduces the contrary notion to that which is rejected in μὴ γένοιτο.

"**through law.**" Throughout this passage St. Paul's purpose is to vindicate the Law of Moses (ὁ νόμος): yet when he is stating a principle *common to law as law*, he omits the article, as in this clause; compare *vv.* 8, 9, and iii. 20.

The conditional rendering, "*I had not known,*" is unnecessary: St. Paul states the *fact* that he came to know sin as sin, only through the law.

This he confirms (γάρ) by further (τε) explaining that he had no practical knowledge of lust until the law forbade it, but sin took occasion thereby, and brought about lust. "Even without the law there is desire in man, but not yet in the ethical definite character of *desire after the forbidden*" (Meyer).

The commandment selected is not merely a sample of the rest, but contains a principle that underlies and embraces them all, a principle which, by forbidding the indulgence of desire, provokes a sinful opposition of the will.

Two kinds of knowledge are here expressed by two different Greek Verbs: the former (ἔγνων) is applied to the abstract metaphysical notion of *sin*, the latter (ᾔδειν) to the sensible experience of strong and perverse desire as a fact first brought under observation, when the dormant propensity was roused by the prohibition of the law. The latter verb is often best rendered by "**wist,**" as in Luke ii. 49; Joh. v. 13.

**8.** The mysterious perversity of man's will ("*Nitimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata,*") is provoked to opposition by the commandment: an *occasion*, or rather a **start**, and impulse (ἀφορμή) is thus given, of which sin, the power lurking unknown in the heart, takes advantage, and works through the commandment to produce every lust which that forbids. See Prov. ix. 17, and note.

Digitized by Google

manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin *was* dead.

9 For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.

10 And the commandment, which

*concupiscence.*] Rather "**lust**" as in *v.* 7. The introduction in A. V. of different words "*lust*," "*covet*," "*concupiscence*," obscures the clear sense of the original. By "**lust**" (ἐπιθυμία) is meant, not the natural desire in itself, but the perversion of this desire into a conscious opposition to a righteous law.

*For without the law sin was dead.*] Rather, "**For without law sin is dead.**" The statement is expressed in the most general terms as an universal truth, though St. Paul has in view no other application of it, except to the law of Moses. Compare iii. 20, iv. 15, v. 13.

Sin is called "*dead*," not as being simply unknown (Aug.), but because, though born with us, it is seemingly still-born, till roused and stimulated into activity. So in Jas. ii. 26, "*faith without works is dead also.*"

**9.** *For I was alive without the law once.*] Rather, "**But** *I was alive* **without law** *once.*" The emphatic "*I*" stands out already in contrast to the "*sin that dwelleth in me*," *v.* 20. I was alive, St. Paul means, not only in the full enjoyment of natural life, but in all the freedom of an untroubled conscience.

But when? Not in paradise (Theodoret), nor in the time before Moses (Chrysostom), for St. Paul is not speaking of the human race personified, and therefore not of Adam or the Patriarchs, but of his own experience: nor yet in a pre-existent state (Celsus and Hilgenfeld), of which the Scripture knows nothing. If any definite time is indicated, the Apostle's thoughts seem to turn back to his early years, with their short dream of

> "Delight and liberty, the simple creed
> Of childhood." (Wordsworth.)

This moral unconsciousness is not limited to childhood: it may pass undisturbed into the form of legal righteousness, as in the rich young ruler, who, when brought face to face with the Commandments, could say, "*All these have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?*" This seems to have been for a time the case with St. Paul, who tells us that he was "*as touching the righteousness that is in the law blameless*" (Phil. iii. 6).

*but when the commandment came.*] In this state "*without law*," the specific commandment already mentioned in *v.* 7, "*Thou shalt not lust*," had not yet presented itself to the individual conscience as a restriction of natural propensity: but when it came as *the word of God quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword*, suddenly all was changed.

*sin revived*] Sin **came to life again**, resuming the active power which properly belongs to it, but had been lying dormant. "*And I died.*" There is a deep tragic pathos in the brief and simple statement: it seems to point to some definite period full of painful recollections. When or how Saul first began to feel the condemning power of the Law, we know not: but in a nature so strong and earnest as his, neither childlike unconsciousness nor untroubled complacency can have been of long continuance. Already in the Pharisee, living according to the straitest sect of his religion, we may discern the intense but unavailing effort to satisfy by outward observance the demands of a holy and heart-searching law. When he became "*a blasphemer, and persecutor, and injurious*" (1 Tim. i. 13), a misguided zeal for God must have been goaded into fury by the sting of an uneasy conscience and the terrors of the Law. Some such desperate moral struggle seems to be intimated, as Philippi suggests, in our Lord's words, "*It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks*" (Acts xxvi. 14). While the outward fury, and the inward strife were both raging with unabated fierceness, the sudden great light, and the accusing voice, flashed conviction upon the soul and subdued the strong proud will. That was the decisive moment of the struggle upon which the Apostle looks back when he says, "*the commandment came, sin* **came to life again**, *and I died.*"

"Sin's death," writes Calvin, "is man's life: conversely sin's life is man's death."

The death which St. Paul here says he had died is to be understood in accordance with ver. 8, "*Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of lust.*" I thus became consciously and in the fullest sense a sinner, and knew that I had no true life in me (cf. vi. 21, 23): that I was dead in God's sight, dead in the absence of all power to work righteousness, dead in the consciousness of deserving God's wrath and condemnation: I knew that there was begun in me a moral and spiritual death, which was a foretaste of eternal death. "With the sense of guilt, the sense of the penalty of death made its appearance: . . . this sense does not distinguish between physical, spiritual, and eternal death." (Lange.)

**10.** *And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*] "*And the commandment which was* **unto life, this was found for me** *to be unto*

Digitized by Google

*was ordained* to life, I found *to be* unto death.

11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew *me*.

12 Wherefore the law *is* holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which

---

*death.*" The commandment was "**unto life,**" because it had the promise attached to it, "*that the man which doeth those things shall live by them*" (x. 5). For though external obedience had only a promise of temporal reward ("*days long in the land,*" Ex. xx. 12), yet such passages as Lev. xviii. 5, Deut. v. 29, 33, Ez. xx. 11, contain promises which an Israelite of spiritual mind would naturally and rightly expand to meet all the fulness of his desires. In the words, "**The commandment—this was found,**" the repetition of the subject increases that tragic emphasis of the sentence on which Chrysostom comments: "He did not say, It has become death, or, It brought forth death, but, It was found; expressing thus the strange and surprising inconsistency."

11. The first words are the same as in *v.* 8, except that their order is changed: sin as the guilty element is placed foremost, giving emphasis to the thought, "It was sin, *not* the commandment, but sin, that by the commandment deceived and slew me." The emphasis is increased by the repetition "*by the commandment deceived and by it slew me.*"

There is an evident allusion to Gen. iii. 13: "*The serpent beguiled me.*" Compare 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14.

Sin's deceit consists in presenting the object of desire as *a good*, though when obtained it at once proves to be *an evil.* Compare James i. 14; Eph. iv. 22; Heb. iii. 13.

*slew me.*] Not merely *showed me* that I was in the way to death, but wrought death in me. Compare note on *v.* 9.

12. *Wherefore.*] "**So that.**" The logical inference from *vv.* 7–11, is expressed as an actual consequence.

Holiness is first asserted as a characteristic of the whole law, and then more fully and specifically of the commandment, "*Thou shalt not covet:*" because this has been described above as offering an occasion for the increased activity of sin.

The epithets, "*holy, and just, and good,*" are not merely a rhetorical accumulation, meaning that the commandment is altogether good; each word has its appropriate sense in relation to the context.

*The commandment is holy* as an utterance of God's holy will, forbidding all impure and unholy lusts. It is "*just,*" or righteous, as demanding only an obedience which, if perfectly rendered, would constitute man's righteousness. It is "*good*" in its aim, as tending to man's temporal and eternal good, being ordained "*unto life*" for them that obey it. This interpretation of "*good,*" is made certain by the way in which St. Paul explains and vindicates, in *v.* 13, his assertion that the commandment is "*good.*"

13. The Apostle has given, in *v.* 12, the first side (μέν) of an intended contrast between the law and sin; but, instead of completing the antithesis at once ("but sin . . ."), he "goes off" at the word "*good,*" to meet an objection which might be urged against the goodness of the commandment, as an inference from his statement in *v.* 10, "*the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*"

*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*] The answer to this question supplies what was at first intended to form the second part of the contrast between the law (*v.* 12) and sin: *God forbid! But sin* (became death unto me) **in order that it might be shown to be sin** (cf. *v.* 7), **by working death to me** *through that which is good.*" The Divine purpose in allowing sin to work death through the law is, that sin may exhibit itself in all its hatefulness, in perverting what is good to evil. This purpose is repeated with great force in a parallel clause, which forms an emphatic and solemn close: "*that sin* **might become exceeding sinful through the commandment.**"

"*Become*" is stronger than "*appear;*" in working death sin becomes in act, and in objective reality, what it has always been according to its nature (see iii. 4, and Meyer thereon).

"Observe the bitter, climactic, sharply and vividly compressed delineation of the gloomy picture" (Meyer). But observe also that God's law is vindicated, and the guilt of man's death rightly fixed on sin; this is the only ray that as yet shines through the darkness. But the light grows stronger in the distinction between "*my true self,*" and the "*sin that dwelleth in me,*" which forms the subject of the next paragraph.

Digitized by Google

is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

14 For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.

15 For that which I do I [1]allow

[1] Gr. *know*.

---

**14–25.** St. Paul now confirms (γάρ) his vindication of the law and exposure of sin by a profound analysis of the operation of sin in man; as his argument in *vv.* 7–13 was based on the distinction, "not the commandment, but sin taking occasion by the commandment;" so here it is based on the deeper distinction, "Not I, but sin that dwelleth in me."

"Hitherto he had contrasted himself, in respect of his whole being, with the divine law; now, however, he begins to describe a discord which exists within himself" (Tholuck).

The true self vindicates the law, even while indwelling sin resists it.

**14.** *For we know that the law is spiritual.*] "Lest any one should suppose that the law was the cause of these evils, he first puts forward his vindication of it with full force, not only acquitting it of blame, but weaving for it a rich crown of praise. And this he presents not as a favour from himself, but as an expression of general consent; as though he had said, This is an acknowledged and manifest truth, that the law is spiritual, so far from its being the cause of sin." (Chrysostom.)

Compare ii. 2, iii. 19, for similar appeals to the general religious consciousness of his readers.

St. Paul does not call the law "*spiritual*" simply as being akin to the higher spiritual part of *man's* nature—an interpretation wholly forbidden by the direct contrast and opposition in which he presents the law as spiritual, and himself as carnal.

The law is regarded throughout as God's law—compare *vv.* 22, 25—and is "*spiritual*," as being in its essential moral nature, like the spiritual part of man, akin to the Divine Spirit. This is the only meaning that satisfies the context; for it is precisely this Divine spirituality that rouses the opposition of the carnal tendency of man's nature, though it is approved by the law of the mind (*v.* 23).

Other interpretations express for the most part, not the exact truth stated by St. Paul, but other truths connected with it as conditions or consequences; *e.g.* "the law was written by Divine inspiration" (Theodoret). It is "a teacher of virtue, and enemy of vice" (Chrysostom). "It requires a sort of heavenly and angelic righteousness, pure and unblemished" (Calvin). "It requires that every thought of man should answer to God's thought: and God is a Spirit" (Bengel).

*but I am carnal.*] See Additional Note on σάρξ, Introduction, § 9.

According to the reading now generally accepted, the word here rendered "*carnal*" (σάρκινος) does not mean "fleshly" in tendency, but "made of flesh." The "flesh," *i.e.* the unspiritual portion of man, has become so predominant over the rest, that it virtually forms the substance of his whole nature, moral as well as physical: "**I am of flesh.**"

This is the Pauline mode of expressing, *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh* (John iii. 6). The Pauline expression of "*That which is born of the Spirit is spirit*," follows in c. viii. (Meyer).

*sold under sin.*] Compare 1 Kings xxi. 25. "*Ahab, which did sell himself* (LXX was sold) *to work wickedness*;" and Isaiah l. 1, "*Behold for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves* (LXX to your iniquities were ye sold)."

The man is thus described as having been brought under the dominion of sin as completely as a slave under the power of the master to whom he has been sold.

A slave that has been sold is more wretched than a home-born slave; and man is said to have been sold, because he had not been a slave from the beginning (Bengel). Slavery to sin is not the rightful condition of our nature. The reason for using the passive form rather than the active "I have sold myself," is seen in *v.* 23.

**15–17.** The statement, "I am sold under sin," is now confirmed (γάρ) by an explanation of the nature and cause of this moral bondage. The consequent relation of the true self (ἐγώ) to the law is seen in *v.* 16, and its relation to sin in *v.* 17.

**15.** *For that which I do I allow not.*] Rather, *For that which I* **perform, I know not.** The slave obeys his master without heeding the result of the act which he performs; so "I," says the Apostle, do not discern the true nature and moral bearing of that which I perform at sin's bidding. The moral sense is not wholly lost nor inactive, but it is confused and overpowered, and so rendered ineffective. "I am in darkness, I am dragged along, I am abused, I am tripped up, I know not how." (Chrysostom.)

Calvin rightly prefers the meaning, "**I know**, I understand, I recognise," to that which is expressed in A. V., "*I allow.*" The margin has "**I know.**" Approval *may accompany* recognition, but it is never directly *expressed* by the word here used.

Digitized by Google

not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.

16 If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that *it is* good.

17 Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with

---

"For he that is mastered by pleasure, or intoxicated with the passion of anger, has not a clear discernment of the sin. But, after the subsidence of the passion, he receives the perception (αἴσθησιν) of the evil." (Theodoret.)

The total suppression of a slave's conscience is well illustrated by such passages as Plautus, 'Capt.' II. i. 6, "Indigna digna habenda sunt, herus quæ facit;" Petronius, 'Satyr.' 75, "Non turpe, quod dominus jubet;" Seneca, 'Controv.' iv., "Impudicitia in ingenuo crimen est, in servo necessitas, in liberto officium;" and Pindar, 'Fragm.' 87, σὺν δ' ἀνάγκᾳ πᾶν καλόν, his excuse for the female slaves dedicated to the service of Venus Urania at Corinth. See Boissier, 'La Religion romaine,' II. 346, and Allard, 'Les Esclaves chrétiens,' p. 136.

*for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.*] **For I practise not that which I wish; but what I hate, that I do.** The A. V. obscures the meaning in two ways:

1. By throwing the negative of the former sentence from the first place to the last, and thereby excluding the relative clause from its influence. *Vv.* 15–17 describe the course of evil action to which the will *does not consent:* in ver. 18 we come to the *will to do good* which cannot fulfil itself in act.

2. By using the same word "*do*" to translate two different Greek verbs, of which the former (πράσσω, "ago," Vulg.) implies a conscious pursuit and aim in the person acting, while the latter (ποιῶ, "facio," Vulg.) describes merely the outward or objective act, which may be mechanical and unconscious: see i. 32.

Both these verbs refer to the action in its *process*, while that which is used in the first clause of the verse (κατεργάζομαι, "operor," "perficio" *v.* 18, Vulg.) refers to the *completion* or *result*.

A paraphrase may now help to make the Apostle's meaning clearer to the English reader. "I am in bondage under sin; for like a slave I perform what sin enforces, without recognising the true nature of the act: for I follow not out in practice any good impulse of my will, but in a blind unreasoning way I do that which in my conscience I hate."

The natural conscience even in *heathens* uttered similar declarations:

> καὶ μανθάνω μὲν οἷα δρᾶν μέλλω κακά·
> θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων,
> (Euripides, 'Medea,' 1074.)

and—

> "Video meliora proboque,
> Deteriora sequor."—Ov. 'Met.' vii.
> (*Wordsworth.*)

**16.** *If then I do.*] Rather, "**But if I do:**" a further step in the argument. The emphasis is on "*I would not,*" which expresses a positive *unwillingness* or dislike, corresponding to "*I hate*" in *v.* 15. But why does St. Paul not retain the same phrase, "*I hate*"? Because the strong utterance of his own vivid experience might not be fully appropriated by all; and the more measured phrase thus forms a surer, and yet sufficient basis for his inference: if I do evil unwillingly and with dislike, I in my moral will or conscience consent to the law that forbids the evil, and affirm "*that it is good.*" The word rendered "*good*" (καλόν) is not the same as in *v.* 12: here it is not the beneficent aim of the law which was ordained unto life, but its moral beauty and excellence that is asserted. Compare note on 1 Pet. ii. 12.

**17.** *Now then it is no more I that do it.*] "**But now it is no more I that perform it.**" As *v.* 16 determines the relation in which I as a whole stand to the law, so this verse concludes that the real agent in bringing the evil to completion is not the true "I" (ἐγώ expressed) "but the sin that dwelleth in me." Thus the emphatic "I," the true self, the innermost conscience, is distinguished from another "*me*" in which sin dwells, and which is more closely defined in the next verse as "*my flesh.*"

Augustine's words in reference to the struggle between flesh and spirit in the process of his conversion are equally applicable here: "I was myself in both; but more myself in what I approved, than in what I disapproved," Confess. viii. 5 (Tholuck).

It is now almost universally admitted that the expressions "*now,*" and "*no more,*" are not *temporal*, distinguishing the speaker's present condition from his former state before grace, but *logical:* "this being the case ("*now*"), there is no room left to say it is I." Compare 1 Cor. xiv. 6; xv. 20; and Rom. vii. 20; xi. 6; Gal. iii. 18 (Lightfoot).

**18–20.** The power of sin has been shown in *vv.* 15–17 from the inability of the true self to hinder what it disapproves; the same is shown now from the inability of the true self to carry out into action what it desires.

Digitized by Google

me; but *how* to perform that which is good I find not.

19 For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

20 Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

21 I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:

---

The parallelism of the two arguments is marked by the repetition of the same conclusion in the same words in *v.* 17 and *v.* 20.

**18.** *For I know that in me, (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing.*] **For I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is in my flesh, any good.** A proof of the reality of indwelling sin (*v.* 17) is furnished by experience of the absence of good: in a moral being, if good dwells not, sin must dwell (Lange).

*for to will is present with me.*] It is essential to a just interpretation of the passage that the Apostle's language concerning the will towards good should be weighed with moderation and candour. He does not use a word expressing the deliberate and final choice which is immediately followed by action (προαιρεῖσθαι, 2 Cor. ix. 7); nor a word expressing a conscious preference and purpose (βούλομαι): but θέλω, which simply means "*I am willing.*"

The connection, however (especially such a word as ξυνήδομαι), implies something more than a cold assent of the understanding. The sense of moral discord has been roused: the inward anguish, so vividly painted in *v.* 24, could not arise without some emotion of the will, some kind of feeble longing and wishing for good, which yet is very different from the earnest decisive willing which passes at once into action.

*is present with me.*] Lit. "Lies before me," ready at hand. St. Paul takes a survey, as it were, of his equipment for the moral warfare: the will (such as already described) is there present and ready, but the performance not.

*but how to perform that which is good I find not.*] If we omit "*I find*" (εὑρίσκω) with modern critics, we must render thus: **but not** *to perform that which is good.*

**19.** Proof that the will is not accompanied by the power of performance (τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὔ, *v.* 18). This verse, however, is not a mere repetition of *v.* 15, as the description of the inefficiency of the will is here intensified by a distinct consciousness of the moral nature of the objects presented to it, both of the good that is left undone and of the evil that is done.

**20.** See notes on *v.* 17. If the emphatic ἐγώ in the first clause is retained, with Tischendorf but not Tregelles, it must be taken with οὐ θέλω. Now if I do that which "I" would not, it is no more "I" that perform it.

**21-23.** The results of *vv.* 14-20 are now summed up.

**21.** *I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.*] Rather: "**I find therefore this law for me who wish to do the good, that to me the evil lies close at hand.**" '**This law,**' literally '**the law,**' *i. e.* the constant rule of experience, that the evil is at hand.

"This experience is very significantly called a "*law,*" because it expresses not an accidental and transient phenomenon, but a necessary and constant one." (Philippi.)

"**The law**" here meant is substantially the "*law in the members*" (*v.* 23), being defined as "**the law—that to me the evil lies close at hand.**" This definition accounts for the use of the Article, and the rule that ὁ νόμος means the Mosaic Law, *except where its meaning is otherwise defined by accompanying words*, is fully satisfied.

This interpretation is strongly confirmed by *v.* 22, where "*the law,*" in the usual sense, is called "*the law of God,*" to distinguish it from this other law in man.

The repetition of the emphatic Pronoun, and its unusual position in the first clause (τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοί), give great prominence to the thought that the self-same "I" is the subject of these opposite experiences, the wish to do good and the intrusion of evil.

Augustine's words in reference to the struggle between flesh and spirit in the process of his conversion are equally applicable here: "I was myself in both; but more myself in what I approved, than in what I disapproved." 'Confessions,' viii. 5 (Tholuck).

The A. V. expresses the same general sense, but without due regard to the exact order and construction of the original. See other interpretations of this obscure and much disputed passage in the note at end of chapter.

**22, 23.** The moral discord just described is now more fully illustrated by a vivid picture of both its opposite elements.

**22.** *For I delight in the law of God after the inward man.*] The rendering needs no improvement: attempts have been made to

Digitized by Google

23 But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

24 O wretched man that I am!

---

express the meaning of the compound verb more closely: "I rejoice with the law of God" (Meyer); "I rejoice with others in the law" (Van Hengel): "I rejoice with myself in the law:" (Philippi). But these are doubtful and unnecessary refinements, not demanded by the usage of the word: see Eurip. 'Rhesus,' 958, 'Hippolytus,' 1286.

This "*delight in the law*" differs from "*consent*," *v.* 16, as belonging to the sphere of feeling rather than of intellect: it thus expresses a stronger moral sympathy with what is good.

*the inward man.*] It is now admitted by all candid and competent interpreters that this expression is *not in itself* equivalent to "*the new man*" (Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10), or "*new creature*" (2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15): it indicates the "*mind*" (νοῦς, *v.* 23 and *v.* 25), "*the spirit of man*" (1 Cor. ii. 11) as contrasted with "*the outward man*," the body or flesh (2 Cor. iv. 16). This "*hidden man of the heart*" (1 Pet. iii. 4), without which man would not be man, is the spiritual, willing, reasoning being, in which the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost begins to form "*the new man*," Eph. iii. 16. The context only can decide whether "*the inward man*" is regarded in his natural or in his regenerate state.

23. *another law.*] Rather, "**a different law**:" the word (ἕτερος) not only distinguishes but often contrasts, as in Gal. i. 6. This other law stands opposed to "*the law of God*," and "*the members*" in which it has its seat to "*the inward man*."

*the law of my mind.*] What he had before called the will to do good, he has here named "*the law of the mind:*" which law of the mind in its own proper action agrees with and consents unto "*the law of God*." On the other hand, the impulses (appetites) of the body and the desires of the flesh he calls the "*law in the members*" (Origen).

The "*mind*" (νοῦς) is here as usually in the N. T. the *moral* reason, the faculty by which good and evil are discerned, the willing as well as the thinking faculty: "when by the divine law man has attained to a consciousness of good and evil, there arises in him a conscious will for the good: . . . . the subject of this will is his νοῦς." (Delitzsch, 'Biblical Psychology,' p. 212.)

The νοῦς is properly an organ of the πνεῦμα, a part of man's spiritual nature; but in that warfare of which the Apostle speaks it is conquered and taken captive to "*the law of sin that is in the members*," and so is termed "*the mind of the flesh*" (Col. ii. 18).

Some commentators distinguish here four laws. So Origen, Methodius, Ewald, Delitzsch ('Bibl. Psych.,' p. 445).

"See," says Photius, in Œcumenius, "how we are set round with laws diametrically opposite. For the first pair flow in upon us from without, the one inviting to do good, *i.e.*, the evangelical law (the law of God), the other calling us aside to evil, that is the conflicting law of the wicked one. But the other pair are within and occupy (συνέχω) the soul; one the law of the mind implanted in us by the Creator and leading towards the better course, but the fourth, which is also 'the law of sin,' is hardened in us because of the habituation to sin."

This interpretation, and the more recent modifications of it, are inconsistent with St. Paul's expression, "*the law of sin which is in my members*," the last words of which show beyond all question that "*the law of sin*" is no other than "*the law in the members*" above mentioned.

It was necessary to characterise this law according to its true nature, and therefore instead of "*bringing me into captivity to* itself," he has written "*to the law of sin which is in my members*" (August. 'de Nupt.' i. 30: so Meyer, Philippi, Tholuck, Photius).

The objection of Van Hengel, that the law which leads man captive cannot be the same to which he is made captive, is answered by the very figure employed, a warrior making his enemy a captive to himself.

The variation ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, accepted by Tischendorf and Tregelles on indecisive testimony, makes no greater difference in the sense than "captive in the law" instead of "captive to the law."

24. The misery caused by this inward conflict and captivity wrings from the heart a wail of anguish and a cry for help. The question, "*Who shall deliver me?*" expresses not only eager longing, but also an almost hopeless feeling of the difficulty of finding a deliverer.

*the body of this death.*] The other rendering, "this body of death," destroys the emphasis laid upon the nature of "*this death*," *i.e.*, of the death which I feel within me, and which I have just described: the desire is not to be released from the body simply as being mortal, but from the body as the seat of this shameful and miserable death of sin (*vv.* 9–11, 13, 23). See note at end.

Digitized by Google

who shall deliver me from [1]the body of this death?

25 I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

[1] Or, *this body of death.*

---

The parts of this verse answer closely to the preceding:

"I am a captive. Who shall rescue me?" "Captive to the law of sin in my members. Who shall deliver me from the body by which I am enslaved to this deadly power of sin?"

25. *I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*] "**Thanks be to God** *through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" This is to be preferred as both the shortest reading (χάρις instead of εὐχαριστῶ, or ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ), and the one which best explains the origin of the others: see note at end.

The language is abrupt, and the sense incompletely expressed, no direct answer being given to the question, "*Who shall deliver me?*" This abruptness is, however, in itself a proof of genuineness, answering as it does most naturally to the outburst of anguish in *v.* 24, and to the sudden revulsion of feeling with which the Apostle turns to view his actual present state in contrast to his former misery.

The cause of thankfulness is not expressed, which is "quite after the manner of lively emotion" (Meyer); but a thanksgiving offered to God "*through Jesus Christ*" implies that He is the author of the redemption so vehemently desired.

*So then with the mind I myself, &c.*] It is better to keep the order of the original, which puts an emphasis on αὐτὸς ἐγώ, "**So then I myself with the mind,**" &c. If Christ is my deliverer, it is implied that "*I myself*" without Christ cannot get beyond the state of distraction and self-contradiction already described in *vv.* 14–23. This inference from the immediate context (ἄρα οὖν) is thus at the same time a summary recapitulation of the whole passage. "*The law of God*" and "*the law of sin*" have both been mentioned above in *vv.* 22, 23, each with its article: here the articles are omitted in order to bring out more clearly *what each law* is in its nature and quality, the one "**a law of God,**" the other "**a law of sin.**"

The proposal of Lachmann, Van Hengel, and others to transfer this latter part of *v.* 25, and put it immediately after *v.* 23 is against all authority, and would destroy the proper sense of αὐτὸς ἐγώ, which is only brought out by contrast with διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

With the proposed transfer, the process of the Apostle's thoughts would be strictly correct and logical, but how tame in comparison with the sudden outburst of emotion expressed in the actual text! At the crisis reached in *v.* 23 there is first an irrepressible burst of anguish, and then a sudden revulsion of thanksgiving as the Apostle for a moment breaks away from the miserable past to the happy present, and then in the close of the verse returns more calmly to the general conclusion of his long description.

It is a much disputed question whether St. Paul in this chapter describes the conflicts of an unregenerate or of a regenerate man. The true answer is given by Dean Jackson (ix. 52) in two words, "inter regenerandum," "in the process of regeneration."

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 1, 5, 6, 21, 25.

1. ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ. Hofmann is right in maintaining against Meyer that the emphasis of thought (as of position) is on ζῇ, and appealing in proof to *v.* 2, τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρί. See also *v.* 3, ζῶντος.

Meyer tries to defend his view by urging that "the very expression ὅσον shows that the emphasis is on ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον, meaning 'all the time that,'" but this is hypercritical and erroneous.

The fuller thought, "so long as he liveth and no longer," far from being utterly irrelevant, is absolutely required. St. Paul's contention is not merely that the Jew, as such, was bound by the law all his life, but more particularly that by death he was set free from it.

This is clear also from vi. 7, "*For he that is dead is freed from sin.*"

5. Παθήματα in this ethical sense occurs in the N. T. only here and in Gal. v. 24.

It is used by Plato (*e.g.* 'Phædo,' 79 D: καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πάθημα φρόνησις καλεῖται) and Aristotle ('Eth. Eudem.' II. ii. 2, 3: κατά τε τὰς δυνάμεις τῶν παθημάτων καθ' ἃς ὡς παθητικοὶ λέγονται, καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἕξεις, καθ' ἃς πρὸς τὰ πάθη ταῦτα λέγονται τῷ [ἤτοι?] πάσχειν πως ἢ ἀπαθεῖς εἶναι), indifferently of all emotions, and as equivalent to πάθος, though this latter word is more commonly applied to evil affections: compare Rom. i. 26; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 5.

ἐνηργεῖτο. See Aristot. 'Eth. Eud.' II. ii. 1,

Digitized by Google

where he shows that ἦθος, which grows out of ἔθος, is acquired by being often moved in a certain way, and so at length the energy or active ἦθος, τὸ ἐνεργητικόν, is formed.

Chrysostom takes ἐνηργεῖτο in a Passive sense, "were wrought in our members," as showing that "the evil is derived from another source, from the thoughts that work, not from the members that are wrought upon."

The Passive occurs in Polybius, I. xiii. 5; IX. xii. 3, 7: xiii. 9; Jos. Ant. Jud. lib. XV. c. v. § 3, l. 40, Dindorf: in all which passages it is used of the operations carried on in war.

A careful consideration of all the examples in the N. T. (1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7; 2 Cor. i. 6; iv. 12; Gal. v. 6; Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29; Jas. v. 16) seems to show that the Middle sense is everywhere preferable to the Passive.

The Active voice is used of an external or independent agent; the Middle, of a power already belonging to the Subject in whom it works.

**6.** The A. V. is formed on the reading ἀποθανόντος, which has no MS. authority, but was introduced into the printed text by Beza, who erroneously inferred from the comment of Chrysostom that he had that reading before him.

τοῦ θανάτου is the reading found in the Greek-Latin uncials D E F G, in the Latin Versions It. and Vulg. (exc. Codex Amiatinus "morientes"), in the Latin Fathers, and in copies mentioned by Origen (or Rufinus), who, however preferred ἀποθανόντες, "sed hoc, id est, *mortui* est verius et rectius." Meyer rightly regards it as "a gloss, having a practical bearing on τοῦ νόμου, which has dispossessed the participle regarded as disturbing the construction." Reiche thinks τοῦ θανάτου was substituted for ἀποθανόντες, as supplying an easy reference for ἐν ᾧ.

ἀποθανόντες has a superabundant weight of authority (Reiche), and is confirmed by the peculiarity of the construction, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, which is difficult, but by no means to be rejected as either contrary to Greek usage or void of a suitable sense. It has been variously rendered.

(a) *We have been discharged by death from the law wherein we were held:* Rückert, De Wette, &c. This rendering gives excellent sense, but is forbidden by the position of ἀποθανόντες.

(b) *We have been discharged from the law by dying in that wherein we were held,* i.e. *in our old man* (Forbes). This, too, gives a good sense, but there is nothing in the immediate context to suggest that the antecedent to be supplied is "*our old man.*"

(c) *We have been discharged from the law by dying in him in whom we were held,* i. e. *in Christ.*

This construction has no support in the immediate context, and the meaning attributed to κατειχόμεθα is unusual and inadmissible.

(d) **We have been discharged from the law by dying unto that wherein we were held,** *i.e.* to the law, in whose grasp we were.

This last construction, which gives the same sense as (a), is adopted by Meyer, Reiche, &c., and is much to be preferred. It states in accordance with the preceding allegory the mode in which we were released from the law, namely by dying to it.

**21.** This passage is regarded by Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers as "a dark saying," and is given up by some modern commentators as hopelessly unintelligible. These interpreters, both ancient and modern, have in fact made for themselves an insuperable stumbling-block, by insisting that τὸν νόμον *must* mean the Mosaic Law. It will be sufficient to give a few specimens of the explanations thus attempted, which for the most part refute themselves.

(a) Chrysostom and the Greek commentators generally, instead of interpreting the passage, almost rewrite it with unwarrantable additions: "I find the law *helping and encouraging* me, who wish to do good, *but am in want of help*, because evil is present with me."

(b) Fritzsche and others govern τὸν νόμον, not by εὑρίσκω but by ποιεῖν, and make "the law" identical with "the good": "I find that to me *who wish to do the law, that is the good*, evil is present."

(c) Ewald, on the contrary, identifies "the law" with "the evil": "I find therefore that *the law*, when I desire to do the good, *lies at hand to me as the evil.*"

(d) New complications are introduced by Meyer:

"Τὸν νόμον is to be understood of the Mosaic Law, and joined with τῷ θέλοντι, ποιεῖν is to be taken as Infinitive of the purpose (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.*, p. 224), and ὅτι κ. τ. λ. as *object* of εὑρίσκω (comp. Esr. ii. 26): *it results to me, therefore, that, while my will is directed to the law, in order to do the good, the evil lies before me.*"

While Meyer justly terms other views, which he rejects, "*forced expedients*," and "*tortuous explanations*," he is surprised that his own interpretation should be regarded as "*harsh*" (Delitzsch), "*forced*" (Philippi), "*strange and meaningless*" (Hofmann).

**25.** The variation in the readings is instructive:

(1) χάρις τῷ θεῷ B Thebaic.

(2) χ. δὲ τῷ θεῷ ℵ* C², some cursives, Memphitic.

(3) ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ D E, d e, v g.



Digitized by Google

(4) ἡ χ. τοῦ κυρίου F G, f g.
(5) εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ ℵ*AKLP, cursives, Syriac.

The excellence of the Vatican Codex (B) is here conspicuous. Its reading, though apparently found in no other known manuscript, and supported only by one version, and a few citations in the Fathers, is unquestionably genuine: it alone explains all the others. For example, the reading of the Textus Receptus (εὐχαριστῶ) may be readily traced to a combination of χάρις with the syllables which precede and follow it in the original reading (ουχαριστω).

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

*1 They that are in Christ, and live according to the Spirit, are free from condemnation. 5, 13 What harm cometh of the flesh, 6, 14 and what good of the Spirit: 17 and what of being God's child, 19 whose glorious deliverance all things long for, 29 was beforehand decreed from God. 38 What can sever us from his love?*

*THERE is* therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

2 For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

---

CHAP. VIII. NATURE OF THE DELIVERANCE ANTICIPATED IN ST. PAUL'S TRIUMPHANT THANKSGIVING IN VII. 25.

**1-11.** Condemnation under "*the law of sin and death*" is abolished by "*the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.*"

**1.** *therefore*] An inference from the thanksgiving in vii. 25, as is shown by the word "*now*," meaning "now that a deliverer has been found in Christ Jesus, like the "*now*" in vii. 6.

This connection is made certain by *v.* 2, which expressly asserts the deliverance as the cause why "*there is now no condemnation.*"

*to them which are in Christ Jesus.*] "To be in Christ" does not mean in St. Paul's writings "to be dependent on Christ" (a common classical usage), nor merely (as Fritzsche tries to prove) to be His follower or disciple, as Pythagoreans or Platonists were followers of their several masters. It implies that living union which Christ Himself first made known: "*Because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in Me, and I in you*" (John xiv. 19, 20: compare John xv. 4–7).

This union with Christ is frequently described by St. John as "being *in Him*": 1 John ii. 5, 6, 24, 28; iii. 24; v. 20.

The same expression is found in 1 Pet. iii. 16; v. 10, 14; but is especially characteristic of St. Paul's writings, being applied by him both to churches (Gal. i. 22; 1 Thess. i. 1; ii. 14; iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 1) and to individuals (1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. i. 1; ii. 10, &c.). What St. Paul affirmed at Athens of all mankind in their natural relation to God, that "*in Him we live and move and have our being*" (Acts xvii. 28), he applies in a higher sense to the spiritual union of believers with Christ. In Gal. iii. 26–28, we see both the inward and outward means of this union, namely, faith and baptism.

In speaking of this union, St. Paul never uses the name "Jesus" alone nor first, but gives prominence to the Divine dignity and saving power of "Christ" (Van Hengel).

"It is a point not of opinion, but of belief, that the Son of God did take our nature upon Him, not only to the end that He might lay it down for our ransom, or suffer for us in the flesh, but to the end withal that, having suffered for us according to His humanity, He might by it *unite us unto Himself as He is God* in a more peculiar manner than our human nature without such union to His human nature was capable of" (Jackson, 'On the Creed,' b. xii.).

This union is represented under various figures as that of the vine and its branches, the foundation and the building, the head and the members: in this passage the context (*v.* 2 compared with vii. 4, 6, 25) suggests "the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church."

The words, "*who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit,*" are rejected by all critics as a gloss brought from *v.* 4. The interpolation is of very early date.

**2.** *For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and* (of) *death.*] "*The law of sin and of death*" from which man is set free must clearly be that to which he has been previously in captivity, namely, "*the law of sin in the members*" (vii. 23), which is also a law of death, as already implied in vii. 11.

This being a power within the man, the law which is opposed to it, and overpowers it, must also be an inward power. Thus "*the law of the Spirit of life*" is not the Gospel, nor its plan of salvation, neither is it "*the*

Digitized by Google

3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and [1]for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

[1] Or, by a sacrifice for sin.

---

*law of the mind*" (vii. 23), which has been already proved powerless against the flesh; but it is the life-giving power of the Holy Ghost, ruling as a law in the heart.

"*The Spirit of life*" is so called, because He is the Author and Giver of life: compare *v.* 11; John vi. 63; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 6.

The genitive expresses the effect wrought, as in John vi. 35, "*the bread of life*," and Rom. v. 18, "*justification of life*."

From "*the Spirit of life*" dwelling in the inner man goes forth a power which not only commands as a law, but also quickens and inspires obedience as a living and life-giving law, and thus sets the man free from the contrary "*law of sin and of death*."

This deliverance was first effected in the Person of Christ, as is shown in *v.* 3, and can be continued only "*in Christ Jesus*," *i.e.* "in fellowship of life with Him, in being and living in Him, *v.* 1" (Meyer).

The verb stands between two prepositional clauses, both dependent on it: "*in Christ Jesus* **made** *me free from the law of sin and of death*." The same arrangement is found also in i. 17, iii. 7, v. 17, the clause with ἐν being placed, as here, before the verb: an emphasis is thus thrown on the words "*in Christ Jesus*," as in 1 Cor. iv. 15; Gal. v. 6.

3. To confirm the truth stated in *v.* 2, St. Paul now declares the actual method by which the liberation from the law of sin and of death is effected; and first he enhances the greatness of the task, as being that which the law of Moses had not power to accomplish.

*For what the law could not do.*] On the construction, see Note at end: the sense is clearly given in the A. V.: "*what the law could not do*," is what God did by other means, *i.e.* "*condemned sin in the flesh*."

The law could not do this, "*in that it was weak through the flesh*,"—a cause of failure already explained in vii. 14–25.

*God sending his own Son.*] After showing exactly wherein the difficulty lay which the law had not power to overcome, the Apostle proceeds to declare how God overcame it.

The language is remarkable: the emphatic words, "*His own Son*," implying the fulness of Divine power in the Son of God, stand in striking contrast between the impotence of the Law and the weakness of Christ's human nature.

*in the likeness of sinful flesh.*] **In likeness of the flesh of sin.**

**The flesh of sin** describes man's animal nature as having become the seat of indwelling sin. But of that nature itself sin is no part nor property, only its fault and corruption. Hence Christ could take true human flesh, "of the substance of the Virgin Mary His Mother," without that quality of sinfulness which it has acquired in us, who are "naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam." "In putting on our flesh He made it His own: in making it His own, He made it sinless" (Tertullian, 'De Carne Christi,' c. 16). Christ thus was sent "**in likeness** *of sinful flesh*," not as if He had taken on Him the "likeness of flesh" in the sense of a semblance of body instead of its reality: but St. Paul means us to understand likeness to the flesh which sinned, because the flesh of Christ, which committed no sin itself, was like that which had sinned,—like it in its nature, but not in the corruption it received from Adam: whence we also affirm that there was in Christ the same flesh as that whose nature in man is sinful (Tertull. ib.). (See Additional Note.)

*and for sin.*] The words might also be rendered: "and as a sin-offering," being so used in the Septuagint, Lev. iv. 33; v. 6, 7, 8, 9; vii. 37; and Ps. xl. 6, and in Heb. x. 6, 8. Here, however, an exclusive reference to sacrifice is not permitted by the context, which refers, not only to the expiation, but also to the practical condemnation and destruction of sin (*v.* 4). The more comprehensive meaning "*for sin*" (*i.e.* "on account of" or "concerning sin") is therefore to be preferred here, and is found in A. V. even in Heb. xiii. 11, where the context expressly limits the meaning to "sacrifice for sin."

*condemned sin in the flesh.*] The rendering "in his flesh," *i.e.* Christ's, is not admissible; for the flesh has already been twice identified in this verse with the "flesh of sin," *i.e.* the flesh in which sin exercises its usurped dominion. How then did God *condemn sin in the flesh*, *i.e.*, in human nature generally? (1) By exhibiting in the person of His Incarnate Son the same flesh in substance but free from sin, He proved that sin was *in the flesh* only as an unnatural and usurping tyrant. Thus the manifestation of Christ in sinless humanity at once condemned sin *in principle*. For this sense of κατακρίνω, to condemn by contrast, see Matt. xii. 41, 42, and Heb. xi. 7.

But (2) God condemned sin *practically and effectually* by destroying its power and casting it out: and this is the sense especially required by the context. The law could condemn sin only in word, and could not make its condemnation effectual. Christ coming "*for sin*" not only made atonement



Digitized by Google

4 That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.

---

for it by His Death, but uniting man to Himself "*in newness of life*" (vi. 4), gave *actual effect* to the condemnation of sin by destroying its dominion "*in the flesh*" through the life-giving sanctifying power of His Spirit.

4. The purpose for which God condemned sin in the flesh.

*That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.*] "*That the* **righteous demand** *of the law*," &c.

The one righteous demand of the law which includes all its other demands (τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου, ii. 26; Luke i. 6; Numbers xxxi. 21, is holy obedience inspired by the love of God (Luke x. 27). That this "**righteous demand** *of the law might be fulfilled in us*)," was the great final cause of God's sending His Son into the world.

Other interpretations of the passage may be classified according to the meanings assigned to δικαίωμα.

(1) "The righteous sentence of the law" in condemnation of sin (i. 32).

This is contrary to the tenor of the passage, and to the plain meaning of the words "*fulfilled in us*": for as to the condemnatory sentence of the law, God's purpose in sending His Son was that it might *not* be fulfilled in us.

(2) The justification, or justifying sentence of the law (v. 16). Fritzsche refers this to the promise (Lev. xviii. 5, Deut. v. 33) that the man who keeps the commandments of God shall find life therein.

But "justification" is not and cannot be ascribed to the law (iii. 20; Gal. iii. 11, 21; Acts xiii. 39): "it is God that justifieth." Accordingly δικαίωμα in this sense is not found with νόμου.

(3) The righteousness or right conduct corresponding to the law's demand (v. 18; Apoc. xix. 8).

In this sense also δικαίωμα is not found in combination with νόμου: and if such usage were established, the general meaning of the passage would be the same as that which we have given above; for the righteousness which satisfies the law is the counterpart of the law's righteous demand.

It may be well to gather up the fragments of truth which underlie these various interpretations.

Christ came indeed that the law's "righteous sentence" of condemnation against sin might be fulfilled, *not in us*, but in His atoning death. He came, that "the justifying sentence," *not of the law*, but of God might be ratified and accomplished upon all who believe in Him. He came also "*to fulfil all righteousness*" in His own Person: not only to give us an example of perfect obedience to the law, but also to redeem us from the curse of the law, and further to "condemn sin in the flesh" by showing that it has not a rightful but only an usurped dominion there, and so to deliver our whole nature, body, soul, and spirit from sin's bondage, and then lastly so to make us one with Himself in this renewed nature, that through the quickening and sanctifying power of His Spirit we also may "*walk in newness of life* (vi. 4), in other words "*that the righteousness of the law* (its demand of holiness) *may be fulfilled in us*."

There is no force in Calvin's objection, that believers renewed by the Spirit do not in fact attain in this life to such proficiency in holiness, that the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in them: for God's purpose, of which St. Paul is here speaking, is clearly affirmed in such passages as Eph. ii. 10, Col. ii. 10. Compare xiii. 8; Gal. v. 14.

This interpretation is placed beyond doubt by the additional clause which defines the *character* of those in whom the righteous requirement of the law is to be fulfilled; namely such as "*walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;*" this *character* is determined by the ruling principle according to which their actual life is regulated. They "*walk not after the flesh*," for the flesh with its affections and lusts rebels against the law, "*but after the Spirit.* "*The Spirit*," being here regarded as the regulating principle (κατά), cannot be man's own spirit however renewed and sanctified, but the Divine power itself which renews and sanctifies, *i.e.* the indwelling Spirit of God, as in *v.* 9.

5. *For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh.*] "To be after the flesh" is to have the flesh for the ruling principle of our being: "to walk after the flesh" (*v.* 4) is to follow this principle in the actual life. The distinction is not meant to be made prominent; but it is necessary to go back from the outward symptom to the cause, in order to derive from that the intermediate process: "*they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh*," and so "*walk after the flesh*."

"*The things of the flesh*" are opposed to "*the things of the Spirit*,"—

(1) as human to divine,—"*Thou savourest* (literally **mindest**) *not the things that be of*

Digitized by Google

1 Gr. *the minding of the flesh.*
1 Gr. *the minding of the Spirit*
1 Gr. *the minding of the flesh.*

6 For [1]to be carnally minded *is* death; but [1]to be spiritually minded *is* life and peace.

7 Because [1]the carnal mind *is* enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

---

*God, but those that be of men*" (Matt. xvi. 23); (2) as earthly things to heavenly (Phil. iii. 19, Col. iii. 2), and (3) in utter moral contradiction, as sin to holiness (Gal. v. 19–21; 22, 23).

**6.** The definition of those in whom the righteousness of the law is to be fulfilled (*v.* 4) is justified and confirmed both on its negative and positive sides by the reason stated in *v.* 3, which reason is itself confirmed by a further development in *v.* 6, and that again is explained on the negative side in *v.* 7.

*to be carnally minded.*] "The lust of the flesh, called in the Greek φρόνημα σαρκός, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God" (Art. ix.). The A. V. is a fair paraphrase of the literal meaning "**mind of the flesh**," in which "**mind**" (or "*minding*" Marg.) means "thought," "purpose," "sentiment," or "study," as in viii. 27, "*God knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit.*"

"**The flesh**" is not the mere material of the body, but "the infection of nature" (Art. ix.). Compare Delitzsch, 'Biblical Psychology,' pp. 439, 442, and Additional Note on σάρξ, Introduction, § 9. The statement that "**the mind of the flesh** *is death*" is explained by St. Paul himself in *v.* 7: for "*enmity against God*," separating man from the only source of life, not only leads to death, but is itself the very essence of death, so that the sinner is dead while he liveth (1 Tim. v. 6).

*but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.*] "*but* **the mind of the Spirit** *is life and peace.*" Meyer's explanation that "the striving of the Holy Spirit tends to lead man to eternal life and blessedness" is inadequate. "**The mind of the Spirit,**" the whole state of thought and feeling which proceeds from the Spirit, dwelling in man's heart (*v.* 9), "*is life,*" the true life of the soul, the first-fruit of that gift of God which is eternal life (vi. 23).

"*Peace*" is not here the act of reconciliation wrought by Christ's death (*v.* 1), but the conscious enjoyment of that reconciliation, the holy calm breathed over the soul by the Holy Ghost pouring forth God's love upon the heart. See note on v. 5.

**7, 8.** St. Paul now follows out separately the proof of the former part of *v.* 6, "**the mind of the flesh is death:**" his argument is explained in the note on that clause. By adding the word "*peace*" to "*life*" in *v.* 6, he has already prepared the way for passing over to the mention of that "*enmity*" which is "*death*" (Bengel). The proof that "**the mind of the flesh** *is enmity against God*" is seen in the fact that "*it is not subject to the law of God:*" and this fact of experience, (fully established in c. vii.) is further traced to its inmost cause in the depraved tendency of "**the mind of the flesh;**" "**for it doth not submit itself** *to the law of God,* **for indeed it cannot.**" "He does not say that it is impossible for the wicked man to become good, but that it is impossible for him remaining wicked to submit to God: by conversion, however, it is easy to become good and submit." (Chrysostom.)

**8.** *So then.*] "**And**" (δέ): the particle marks "the continuation under a slightly changed form" (Bp. Ellicott) of the opening statement of *v.* 7: "*Because* **the mind of the flesh** *is enmity against God* . . . . **and** *they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*" From the abstract principle he passes to its practical result.

**9.** *But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.*] Personal application to the readers of the general statements of *vv.* 5–8. "*Ye*" is emphatic.

"*The flesh*" and "*the Spirit,*" represented in *v.* 5 as ruling principles, according to which men's moral life is regulated, here appear as opposite elements, in one or other of which that life subsists.

*if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.*] It is characteristic of St. Paul that he first expresses his strong and loving confidence in his readers in the absolute assertion, "*Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit:*" and then, remembering that so unqualified a statement could not safely be applied to all, he adds, by way of caution, and stimulus to self-examination, the condition upon which his statement concerning them necessarily depends, a "conditio sine qua non."

Digitized by Google

10 And if Christ *be* in you, the body *is* dead because of sin; but the Spirit *is* life because of righteousness.

---

"For the Spirit of God must dwell in the man in order that He may be the determining element in which the man lives:" compare St. John's expression "*Ye in me, and I in you*" (Meyer). For the conditional "*dwell*" read "**dwelleth**:" see note at end.

*Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ.*] "**But if any man hath not,**" &c.

The favourable supposition, "*if the Spirit of God* **dwelleth** *in you*," was applied to the readers generally: but on the unfavourable side St. Paul puts only the supposition that this or that man among them "**hath** *not the Spirit of Christ*." It is clear from the connection that "*the Spirit of Christ*" is the same as "*the Spirit of God*," *i.e.*, the Holy Ghost, who is not only sent by Christ, but is so essentially one with Christ, that His indwelling is in the next clause described as "*Christ in you*:" see Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19. The theological import of the passage is well explained by Philippi, who shows that, when compared with Gal. iv. 6, it is a clear proof of the procession of the Holy Ghost "from the Father and the Son," as well as "an illustrious testimony concerning the Holy Trinity" (Bengel).

*he is none of his.*] The reason for changing the title "*Spirit of God*" into "*Spirit of Christ*" was to bring out clearly and emphatically this truth that "he that hath not Christ's Spirit, is not Christ's: because Christ gives His Spirit to all that are His" (1 John iv. 13). "To be Christ's" is the same as "to be in Christ" (Gal. iii. 28, 29).

10. *And if Christ be in you.*] "**But** *if Christ* **is** *in you*:" this is a direct contrast to the latter part of *v.* 9, and a renewal of the favourable supposition in the former part, "*if the Spirit of God* **dwelleth** *in you*." It now further appears that "to have the Spirit of Christ" (*v.* 9) is to have Christ Himself dwelling within the heart: compare Eph. iii. 16, 17: "*to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.*"

*the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life.*] Rather, "**though** *the body is dead because of sin*, **yet** *the Spirit is life.*"

"*If Christ* **is** *in you*," it follows that "*the Spirit is life*;" yet in contrast to that effect it is admitted (μέν) that for the present "*the body is dead*:" but even this contrast and limitation to the Spirit's operation shall be done away hereafter (*v.* 11).

The reference in *v.* 11 to the resurrection of the mortal body makes it certain that in saying "*the body is dead*" St. Paul is thinking of physical death on account of sin: compare v. 12.

"Methinks" (says Augustine, who dwells much upon this passage), "that thought so clear and plain needs not to be expounded, but only to be read." ('De Peccatorum Meritis,' i. 7).

"The Apostle does not say, "The body is mortal because of sin," but "*the body is dead because of sin*." For prior to Adam's sin it might be called both mortal for one reason and immortal for another reason: that is, mortal, because it was capable of dying: immortal, because it was capable of not dying. . . . And so that animal and therefore mortal body, which on account of righteousness should have become spiritual and therefore altogether immortal, was made on account of sin not "mortal," which it was before, but "*dead*," which it might never have become if man had not sinned."

"How therefore does the Apostle, when speaking about persons still living, call our body '*dead*,' except because the necessity of dying clung to the children from the sin of their parents?" ('De Genesi ad litteram,' vi. 36).

The body thus doomed to certain death, and bearing in itself the germs of corruption, is in St. Paul's vivid conception already "*dead*," "a living corpse" (Soph. 'Antigone,' 1167).

*but the Spirit is life.*] "*the* **spirit**," *i.e.* the human spirit; it is implied not in the word itself, but in the condition "*if Christ* **is** *in you*," that the human spirit is quickened by the indwelling Spirit of God. This reference to the human spirit is proved by the direct contrast of "*the body*" and "*the spirit*" (1 Cor. vii. 34; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Ja. ii. 26), and by the careful distinction of the Divine Spirit in *v.* 11, as "*the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead.*"

The spirit of man, when renewed and pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, not only lives, but is all "*life*," essentially and eternally. The inferior reading (ζῇ, "liveth") falls far short of St. Paul's thought: "the Divine life becomes through the Holy Spirit not only a *quality* of the human spirit, it becomes its *nature*, in such wise, that it can diffuse itself through the whole person from the spirit to the soul and body" (Godet).

*because of righteousness.*] Since cause goes before effect, the righteousness which is the conditional *cause* of life in the believer (as sin is the cause of death), is that "*righteousness of God*" which is freely given for Christ's

Digitized by Google

11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies [1]by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

[1] Or, because of his Spirit.

12 Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.

13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

---

sake, which is accompanied by the gift of eternal life (v. 17, 18, 21), and which brings forth as its fruit the works of righteousness.

The same conclusion follows from the antithesis of the two clauses; "*the body is dead because of* (Adam's) *sin*, *but the* **spirit** *is life because of* (Christ's) *righteousness:*" compare, ch. v. 12, 15, 17.

"Propter justificationem" (Vulg.) is therefore right as a paraphrase, though not as a translation of διὰ δικαιοσύνην. On the other hand Cyril's interpretation is wholly inadmissible: "Being quickened by the grace of the Holy Spirit and rich in righteousness through communion with Him: for thus are we partakers of the divine nature."

**11.** The present possession of the Spirit of God is an assurance that even in the body life shall at last triumph over death. The condition, "*if Christ* **is** *in you*," is now repeated in substance, but changed in form to suit the new statement concerning God's raising up Jesus from the dead.

*But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you.*] Rather "**dwelleth** *in you:*" see on *v.* 9.

"*The Spirit of God*," called also "*the Spirit of Christ*" in *v.* 9, is now introduced under a new title, which in fact forms part of the argument; because it is assumed that He who raised Jesus from the dead can also raise us. Though the Son as God had power to lay down His life and to take it again (John ii. 19, x. 18), yet Jesus as Man is raised by the power of God the Father (Acts ii. 32; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 20: compare Pearson, 'Creed,' Art. v. p. 301).

*he that raised up Christ from the dead.*] The mediatorial title "*Christ*" ("Christ Jesus," Tisch. 8) corresponds to the assumed connection between His resurrection and ours. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14.

*shall also quicken your mortal bodies.*] Instead of "raise," St. Paul now says "*quicken*," or "make alive" (ζωοποιεῖν), in correspondence with *v.* 10: "*the spirit is life*" already, the body also shall be made alive hereafter. In *v.* 10 the body is called "*dead*," a hyperbolic expression, which would be weakened by repeating the same word in the same sense, and obscured by applying it in a different sense to bodies actually dead. St. Paul therefore now applies the proper word "*mortal*" to the present state of the body, which shall hereafter be quickened into immortality.

"He does not say 'dead bodies,' but '*mortal bodies;*' because in the resurrection our bodies shall not only cease to be '*dead*' (*v.* 10), *i.e.* subject to a necessity of death, but also shall cease to be '*mortal*,' *i.e.* capable of dying, such as was Adam's body before his sin. For after the resurrection our bodies shall be altogether immortal." (Aquinas.)

*by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*] See note at end of chapter.

The marginal reading "**because of his** *Spirit that dwelleth in you*" is most in accordance with the language of the N. T., which nowhere represents the Holy Ghost as the special agent or instrument by whom the dead are raised. "The bodies of the saints are the *members of Christ*, and no members of His shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore if they be destroyed, they shall be raised again." For "*if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us*," as He doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, "*he which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by* (**because of**) His Spirit that dwelleth in us" (Pearson, 'Creed,' Art. v.). Compare 2 Cor. v. 5, where St. Paul speaks of the gift of the Spirit as an earnest of the resurrection.

**12, 13.** Practical exhortation founded upon the consequences which have been shown (*vv.* 1-11) to follow from living after the flesh or after the Spirit.

*Therefore.*] "**So then:**" as in vii. 3. You have seen (*vv.* 6-8) that if "flesh" be the ruling principle of your life "**ye must die**" (Tyndale: μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν), and this sure and known result is not such as to lay you under any obligation to the flesh: you owe it nothing by anticipation, that you should live according to its rule.

*but if ye through the Spirit do mortify.*] "**but if by the Spirit ye mortify.**"

In *v.* 12 the order of the words "*we are*

Digitized by Google

14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

15 For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of

---

*debtors—not to the flesh*," leads our thoughts on at once to the well-known and necessary alternative (*v.* 4), "but to the Spirit that we should live after the Spirit:" the reason therefore of that suppressed alternative is now added.

"*The deeds of the body*" are not bodily acts as such, but its actions or practices (πράξεις) considered in their moral tendency, which in this case is towards evil: compare Col. iii. 9.

For "*the body*" is here regarded as "*the body of sin*" (vi. 6), *i.e.* as ruled by sin dwelling in its flesh. The various reading "the flesh" is of less authority.

The way to "*mortify*," or "put to death" (θανατοῦτε) these "*deeds of the body*," is to subdue by help of God's Spirit the sinful desires which are their motive power. In the clauses "*ye shall die*," "*ye shall live*," the death and life are both eternal.

14-17. Proof of the promise "*ye shall live*," from the nature of the indwelling Spirit as a Spirit of adoption.

**14.** All who are moved and guided by the Spirit and follow His guidance, these, emphatically (οὗτοι, vii. 10; Gal. iii. 7) and none but these, are the sons of God, and as sons derive life from the Father, Who is the fount of life. On the difference between receiving the Spirit and being "*led by the Spirit*," Chrysostom remarks: "Lest in reliance upon the baptismal gift they should be careless of their after life, he says that even if you receive Baptism but intend not to be led by the Spirit afterwards, you have lost the dignity conferred and the pre-eminence of sonship."

**15.** In proof of the assertion that "they who are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God," St. Paul appeals to his readers' experience of the character and effect of the Spirit which they had received.

*For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear.*] "*For ye* **received not a spirit** *of bondage again* **unto** *fear.*"

The aorist points to the time when believing and being baptized they received the Holy Ghost: that what they then received was "*the Spirit of God*," by Whom they are still led (*v.* 14), is clearly stated in Gal. iv. 5, 6, and is here assumed in the appeal to their experience. The question to be decided by that experience is, What kind of spirit that was; and the answer is twofold, the verb being emphatically repeated, "**Ye received not a spirit of bondage, but ye received a spirit of adoption.**" The word "**spirit**" is in both clauses a Common Noun, not a Proper Name, and therefore should not be written with a capital letter. Compare 2 Tim. i. 7.

The "*bondage*" or "slavery," which throughout this Epistle is contrasted with the liberty of the sons of God, is the bondage of sin (vi. 6, 16, 17, 20; vii. 25), and of corruption or death as the consequence of sin (*v.* 21). The Apostle's readers, both Jews and Gentiles, had all been *once* under this bondage (vi. 17) which tends "**unto** *fear*," even the fear of death (Heb. ii. 14, 15). But the Spirit which they received on becoming Christians was not found to be "**a** *spirit of bondage* tending *again unto fear*," but "**a spirit** *of adoption*" or "affiliation"—a spirit which properly belongs to and is characteristic of adopted children.

*Adoption* was a process unknown to the Jewish law, and the word υἱοθεσία, first found in Gal. iv. 5, was probably formed by St. Paul himself. From this circumstance and from the fact that St. Paul, a Roman citizen, is here writing to Romans, it is almost certain that the allusion is to the Roman law. St. Paul's word was in later times applied to Baptism (Suicer): he applies it himself to God's typical adoption of the Jewish nation (ix. 4), to the actual adoption of believers both Jews and Gentiles to be the children of God (Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5), and to their perfected adoption in the future state of glory (viii. 23). Comp. Neander, 'Planting of Christianity,' i. 477, and Ellicott, 'Gal.' iv. 5.

In the phrase "*spirit of adoption*" the genitive does not mean that adoption is the effect of having received the Spirit (Athanasius ad Serap. Ep. i. c. 19 υἱοποιούμενοι τῷ πνεύματι): for in the parallel passage Gal. iv. 6, we see that the adoption goes before the testimony of the Spirit, "having taken place through faith and justification" (Meyer). Yet this Pauline doctrine is perfectly consistent with the Spirit's previous work of regeneration (John iii. 5), for "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God*" (1 John v. 1). St. Paul, in fact, is here speaking not of the first secret work of the Spirit in regenerating the soul by faith, but of the subsequent testimony of the Spirit, which, whether accompanied or not by outward signs, bore witness in the hearts of believers that they had become sons of God.

A "*spirit of adoption*" is thus a spirit belonging to adoption as its proper character,

Digitized by Google

adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

16 The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:

17 And if children, then heirs;

---

and "*a spirit of bondage*" would in like manner be "a spirit characteristic of bondage" and so tending "unto *fear*."

Commentators ancient and modern have here run wild in their attempts to give a positive and personal existence to that of which St. Paul speaks only negatively. "Some say it is the spirit of the Evil One, but it is not so; for it is the Law that he here calls a spirit of bondage" (Severianus in Cramer: so Diodorus, Theodorus). "The law as given by the Holy Spirit" (Theodoret). "The Scriptures, as being spiritual and supernatural, but establishing a dispensation in which punishments and rewards were meted out like the daily portion of a slave" (Chrysostom; Theophyl. Œcumen.) Augustine applies it to the Holy Ghost, "because the same Spirit of God, that is, finger of God, whereby the Law was written on tables of stone, struck terror into those who knew not yet God's grace, that by the Law they might be convinced of their infirmity and sin" ('Quæst. in Exod.' lv.; comp. Serm. 156). But in another passage ('Propositiones ex Ep. ad Rom. expos.') he explains it as "the spirit of him to whom sinners are in bondage: so that, as the Holy Spirit delivers from the fear of death, the spirit of bondage who hath the power of death holds the guilty in fear of that same death; in order that each may turn to the Deliverer's help, even in spite of the Devil, who desires to have him in his power always."

Philippi and others understand the expressions subjectively of the servile and filial spirit or disposition engendered by the Law and the Gospel respectively; but this is opposed to the meaning of πνεῦμα required by the context in *vv.* 14, 16. These difficulties all arise from neglecting the order of the words: St. Paul did not write "Ye have not *received again* a spirit of bondage," but "a spirit of bondage *bringing you again into a state of fear.*" Compare 2 Tim. i. 7.

*whereby we cry.*] Literally "in which (spirit) *we cry*": compare 1 Cor. xii. 3. In the sudden change from the 2nd to the 1st person we see St. Paul himself in the same filial spirit joining in his brethren's cry.

*Abba, Father.*] See note on Mark xiv. 36.

**16.** Analysis of what takes place when we in the Spirit cry "*Abba, Father*:" there is then a twofold but united testimony, we cry and the Spirit cries in us (Gal. iv. 6). "*The Spirit itself*," i.e. the Spirit of God, which has just been described as a spirit of adoption, "*beareth witness with our spirit.*" This rendering is more correct than that of the Vulgate "to our spirit": it implies that our spirit also bears witness to us, an idea to which Lange strangely objects, forgetting that it is what occurs in every act of consciousness.

St. Paul is conscious that the impulse to cry "*Abba, Father*" proceeds from his own spirit acting under the influence of the Holy Spirit and in concert with Him: compare ii. 15, and ix. 1: "*my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.*" "This witness of the Spirit is not to be placed merely in the feeling (1 John iii. 19), but His whole inward and outward efficacy must be taken together; for instance, His comfort, His incitement to prayer, His censure of sin, His impulse to works of love, to witness before the world, and so forth. Upon the foundation of this immediate testimony of the Holy Spirit, *all the regenerate man's conviction of Christ and His work* finally rests. For faith in the Scripture itself has its basis upon this experience of the divinity of the principle which it promises, and which flows into the believer while he is occupied with it." (Olshausen.)

The passage testifies strongly against the Pantheistic confusion of the human spirit and the Divine.

"The witness of the Spirit is a consciousness of our having received in and by the Spirit of adoption the tempers mentioned in the word of God as belonging to his adopted children,—a loving heart towards God and toward all mankind; hanging with childlike confidence on God our Father; desiring nothing but Him, casting all our care on Him. . . . It is a consciousness that we are inwardly conformed by the Spirit of God to the image of His Son, and that we walk before Him in justice, mercy, and truth, doing the things which are pleasing in His sight." (Wesley, in Lange's 'Commentary.')

**17.** *And if children, then heirs.*] The Apostle follows out his proof of the promise in *v.* 13: "*ye shall live*," for ye are God's children (*vv.* 14–16), and therefore heirs of His inheritance, "the glory which shall be revealed in us" (*v.* 18), which is, in other words, eternal life: compare ii. 7.

For "*sons*" St. Paul now says "*children*," which is both more tender (Meyer), and more comprehensive. (Gal. iii. 26–28.)

*heirs of God.*] Two thoughts enhance the greatness of the inheritance, that it comes from God, and is shared with Christ. The

Digitized by Google

heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with *him*, that we may be also glorified together.

18 For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time *are* not worthy *to be compared* with the glory which shall be revealed in us.

19 For the earnest expectation of

---

Divine inheritance, unlike the human, is bestowed by the living Father upon His children. (Luke xv. 12.)

*and joint-heirs with Christ.*] By Jewish law the eldest son had the largest share, and daughters were excluded, unless there were no sons. ('Dict. of the Bible,' p. 779, b, 'Heir.') By the Roman law sons and daughters shared equally in the inheritance, and adopted children were treated like others. (Smith's 'Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Antt.,' p. 600, a.) Christ admits all His brethren to share alike in that inheritance which He has won, not for Himself but for them.

*if so be that we suffer with him.*] It was part of the Divine order of salvation "*that Christ must suffer*," and through suffering pass to glory (Luke xxiv. 26, 46; Acts xvii. 3; xxvi. 23; Hebrews ii. 9, 10), and also that His followers must suffer with Him, in order to be glorified together. (Matt. x. 38; xvi. 24; xx. 22; 1 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 5; Col. i. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 12; &c.). To "*suffer with him*" is to suffer "for His sake, and the Gospel's" (Mark viii. 35): compare 1 Peter iv. 13, "*Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.*"

On εἴπερ see note on *v.* 9: it represents "*the fellowship of his sufferings*" (Phil. iii. 10) as an indispensable condition of sharing His glory, a necessary discipline to fit us for that blissful reward which is purchased for us by the sole merit of our Saviour's own sufferings. "In all nations, indeed, and at all times, the way in which men have met death, and women have met suffering, has been a testimony to the conviction that pain, when endured for a moral purpose, may be transformed from a curse into a blessing, and may elevate the nature on which it seems to inflict a wound. But this conviction has been established as one of the supreme laws of human nature by the cross of Christ" (Wace, 'Christianity and Morality,' p. 316).

18–30. THE SOURCES OF COMFORT UNDER THE NECESSITY OF SUFFERING.

These are threefold:

(1.) The hope of glory to which all creation looks forward (18–25):

(2.) The present help of the Spirit (26, 27):

(3.) The all-embracing purpose of God's sure love (28–30).

**18.** *For I reckon.*] A reason for suffering with Christ in order to be glorified with Him. The connexion with the last words of *v.* 17 is direct and obvious. The same word (λογίζομαι) is rendered in A. V., "*think*" (ii. 3), "*conclude*" (iii. 28), "*suppose*" (2 Cor. xi. 5), "*count*" (Phil. iii. 13). It does not imply mere supposition or opinion, but the judgment or inference which the Apostle draws from comparing things present and things to come, that the former are of no weight or worth in the comparison. "*This present time*" (καιρός) indicates the critical and final season of the dispensation of "this world" (αἰών), a season of distress which is to end at Christ's coming: compare iii. 26 and xi. 5 with xiii. 11 and 1 Cor. vii. 29.

*shall be revealed.*] The glory already exists in Christ, it only remains to be revealed in us. St. Paul does not use the simple Future Tense, but (as in *v.* 13 and iv. 24) an expression (μέλλουσαν) which represents the future revelation of glory as something that is destined to be and will be. Compare Gal. iii. 23, where the same words are used in the same emphatic order. See also Col. iii. 4; Tit. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 4.

*in us.*] The Greek preposition (εἰς) expresses the thought that the revelation of glory will *reach to* and take place *in* us.

**19.** The *certainty* of the future revelation of glory in us is confirmed by the sympathetic longings of all around us. Keble, in the 'Christian Year' (4th S. after Trin.), has found a theme for one of his finest poems in these 'Groans of Nature,'—

> "Strong yearnings for a blest new birth,
> With sinless glories crown'd."

*the earnest expectation* (compare Phil. i. 20) is described by expressive compounds, such as St. Paul loves, in which hope is depicted both in its eagerness "with head uplift," (ἀποκαραδοκία) and in its perseverance waiting out the end (ἀπεκδέχεται: compare 1 Pet. iii. 20).

*the creature.*] Rather "**the creation**," *i.e.* the things created (Vulg. "creatura"). The word itself is of unlimited application (Mark xiii. 19), and the context only can determine the extent of its meaning.

Of things created, to begin with the highest, good Angels are excluded, for they were not "*made subject to vanity*" (*v.* 20); and evil

Digitized by Google

the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.

20 For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope,

---

Angels, for they have no share in the hope of glory: of Mankind it is clear that believers are not here included under "**the creation,**" but mentioned separately and distinctly as sharing the same longing, for "*not only they* (the creation) *but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we* (*v.* 23) *ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption.*" So far there is a very general consent among interpreters, though some (in defiance of the clear distinction made in *vv.* 19, 21, 23) maintain that even believers are included under "**the creation**" as a part under the whole.

The chief point, however, in dispute is the inclusion of the *non-Christian* portion of mankind.

Now, first the term "creation" (κτίσις) when applied to mankind always denotes *mankind as a whole*, the human creation. But in *v.* 21 a portion of mankind, "*the children of God,*" are contrasted with, and so excluded from "**the creation** *itself,*" which term therefore can only mean, "the creation as distinct from mankind," the irrational creation, animate and inanimate. The Apostle "personifies the world, just as the Prophets do when they make the floods clap their hands." (Chrysost.)

It is one of the finest and most frequent figures of speech thus to make Nature sympathise with man: when the Assyrian is overthrown, God says, "*I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees of the field fainted for him.*" (Ezek. xxxi. 15.) Here in like manner St. Paul undoubtedly ascribes human feelings to things without reason and without life: but he does much more. Under this beautiful figure, as its most appropriate dress, he presents the grand truth revealed in the Old Testament that the whole world of nature, so much of it at least as was placed under man's dominion, has a real concern in the past history and future destiny of Man. When God says to Adam, "*cursed is the ground for thy sake*" (Gen. iii. 17); when the Flood, by which Man's wickedness is punished destroys "*every living substance which was upon the face of the ground*" (Gen. vii. 23): when "*the earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant,*" and "*therefore hath the curse devoured the earth,*" and when not only "*they that dwell therein are desolate,*" but also "*the new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth,*" "*the windows from on high are open, and the foundations of the earth do shake*" (Is. xxiv. 5 ff.); in all such passages, whether historical, poetical, or prophetic, the same truth, or at all events the same doctrine, is expressed which St. Paul states in *v.* 20, that "*the* **creation** *was* **subjected** *to vanity.*"

When once this is admitted, there is no room left for the argument that *Man* must be included by St. Paul in "**the creation**" as "that which gives propriety, consistency, and beauty to the whole representation." (Forbes.)

If "in speaking of that glorious restitution of all things, which has been the theme of all the Prophets, and the great hope of the Church since the world began, St. Paul mentions on the one hand the little flock that had then received the first-fruits of the Spirit, and on the other hand, the material and irrational creation:" it does not follow that "the innumerable multitudes of '*all the families of the earth,*' not yet converted to Christ, are by him who was specially called to be the Apostle of the Gentiles passed by, without a thought on their condition or destiny!"

The truth is that like Isaiah (lxv. 17), like St. Peter (2nd Ep. iii. 13), and like St. John (Rev. xxi. 1), St. Paul looked for "*a new heaven and a new earth:*" but before that "*restitution of all things,*" he expected that "*the fulness of the Gentiles*" should come in, and "*all Israel be saved.*" Mankind therefore, so far as they fulfil their proper destiny, in accordance with the great promise, "*in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,*" are all included among "*the sons of God,*" while "*the whole creation*" includes all the irrational creatures, animate or inanimate, as in Wisdom xvi. 24; xix. 6.

*the manifestation of the sons of God.*] That is "**the revelation** *of the sons of God*" themselves, not merely of their glory: they will become known as "*the sons of God*" through the glory which shall then be imparted to them. At present, though known of God and knowing Him as their Father (*vv.* 14–17), "*the world knoweth them not, because it knew him not.*" (1 John iii. 1.)

### 20, 21. The Cause of the Longing and the Ground of the Expectation.

**20.** *the creature was made subject to vanity.*] **The creation was subjected** *to vanity.* The emphasis is on the "vanity," that well-known vanity of things created (τῇ ματαιότητι). "Though all things were made very good, yet when the first man sinned they were corrupted, and shall return no more to their

21 Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

22 For we know that [1]the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.

23 And not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan

[1] Or, *every creature.*

---

proper state, until Pherez, i. e. Messias, shall come." (Beresh. Rabb. f. 2, 3. Reiche.)

The Greek word rendered "*vanity*" is from a root which means "to seek without finding," and so implies "frustration": but this etymological sense must not be pressed, it is the word commonly used in the Septuagint, *e. g.* in Ecclesiastes i. 2, ii. 1, for the Hebrew הֶבֶל (Hebel, Abel), "breath," "vapour," applied to all that is frail and fleeting. Compare note on i. 21.

*not willingly.*] Subjection to vanity is contrary to that tendency of nature, which leads each creature to seek its own preservation and perfection. This tendency is compared to the human Will, because creation is personified.

*but by reason of him who hath subjected the same.*] Rather, "**but on account of him who subjected it.**" (See note on John vi. 57.) The Apostle mentions no other *cause* of the subjection of the creation to vanity than the agency and will of "*him who* **subjected it.**" This, in accordance with the history, can be no other than God. He who first placed the creature under man's dominion also "**subjected it**" to the effects of man's sin (Gen. iii. 17, v. 29), and will make it partaker of the blessing of his restoration. Compare Is. lxv. 17 ff.; lxvi. 22; Ps. cii. 26, 27; 2 Pet. iii. 13: Rev. xxi. 1; and see note on Is. xi. 6 as to the reasonableness of this Scriptural doctrine of the new creation.

*in hope, because the creature itself also.*] Rather, "**in hope that the creation itself also.**" These words are best connected with the former part of *v.* 20: the subjection was not absolute and unconditional, but the condition upon which "**the creation was subjected to vanity**" was a *hope* granted to it, **that** it also shall share in man's deliverance. This purport of the hope must be expressly stated, in order to show the ground of the expectation in *v.* 19, as directed precisely to the manifestation of the sons of God. An undefined hope might supply a motive for expectation of deliverance in general, but not for expectation of sharing in the glory of the children of God. (Meyer.)

*the bondage of corruption.*] "*Corruption*" includes the daily perishing as well as the final dissolution of things created. This subjection to decay and death is what St. Paul calls "*the bondage of corruption.*" Compare Heb. ii. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 16.

*the glorious liberty, &c.*] Rather, "**the liberty of the glory** of *the children of God.*" This glory, being a full and perfect development of all the faculties and powers of our nature, is rightly called "*liberty*" in opposition to "*the bondage of corruption.*" The whole creation is to undergo a corresponding change, and become the fit scene of the glory of God's children. "In those days shall the whole creation be changed for the better, and return to its pristine perfection and purity, such as it was in the time of the first man before his sin" (R. Bechai Schulchan Orba, f. 9, col. 4, quoted by Reiche).

**22.** Proof of the reality of this hope of deliverance (*v.* 21), from the present signs of pain and travail.

*For we know.*] St. Paul appeals to his own and his readers' knowledge of a condition of all nature, analogous to that of a woman in travail. The knowledge of *the fact*, which alone is meant here, is derived from observation and experience: the knowledge of its dependence on man's Fall (*v.* 20) is derived from revelation. This groaning of creation is universal, consistent (συμφώνως, Theophyl.), and unceasing. The *whole* creation groaneth *together* from the day of its subjection *until now*. These pangs of a world in travail cannot be unmeaning: they point to a coming time of delivery, when "there shall be new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

**23.** Beyond this fact of common experience lies another, peculiar to the *Christian* consciousness, and of yet deeper significance for the reality of the hope of deliverance described in *v.* 21.

*And not only they.*] Rather, *And not only* **the creation.**" The word to be supplied, for there is none in the Greek, is clearly indicated by the antithesis which follows—"*but we ourselves also.*"

*which have the firstfruits of the Spirit.*] Rather, "**though we have,**" &c. This clause completes the climax of proof by the thought that even Christians, though so highly favoured as recipients of the first outpouring of the Spirit, were not exempt from an eager and painful longing for the full liberty and glory which were yet to be bestowed on them. Not only the Apostles on the day of

Digitized by Google

within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the [a]redemption of our body.

Luke 21. 28.

24 For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

25 But if we hope for that we see not, *then* do we with patience wait for *it*.

26 Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh

---

Pentecost, but all who in that first age had been added to the Church through their teaching, are regarded by St. Paul as sharing in the first gift of that Spirit, which is in due time to be poured out on all flesh: they have the first-fruits which are to be followed by the great harvest. That harvest must be fully gathered, before the final revelation of glory can take place, or the longing and sighing cease.

*even we ourselves*] **We ourselves also**: this rendering preserves the emphatic repetition of the original, according to the reading preferred by recent critics. The various readings do not materially affect the general sense.

*groan within ourselves.*] The longing of creation is expressed in outward signs and in a sort of universal sympathy (συστενάζει): the longing of the believer is inward, known only to his own heart.

*waiting for the adoption.*] Rather, **waiting for adoption**. Believers have already received adoption in part, namely in God's purpose and in the gift of a Spirit which belongs only to God's children (*vv.* 14–16); but are still waiting for that final, complete, and public adoption which will take place in "**the revelation** *of the sons of God*" (*v.* 19).

*to wit, the redemption of our body*] By this apposition the Apostle explains how those who are already the sons of God can still be waiting for adoption. The adoption, "viewed specifically as complete" (Lange), is identified with that part which completes it, namely "*the redemption of our body*" from its present condition of weakness, sinfulness, decay, and death: "*For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven*" (2 Cor. v. 2).

**24.** *For we are saved by hope.*] **For in hope we were saved.** St. Paul says sometimes "ye" (or we) were saved (Rom. viii. 24), or "Ye have been saved" (Ephes. ii. 5, 8), sometimes "Ye are being saved" (1 Cor. xv. 2), and sometimes "Ye shall be saved" (Rom. x. 9, 13). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that "'salvation' involves a moral condition which must have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter" (Bp. Lightfoot, 'Revision,' p. 94). The reason why we are still waiting for the redemption of our body is that the salvation of which we were made partakers (by faith not "*by hope*") is still an object of hope, not of complete realisation and present possession. The A. V. "*by hope*' disregards St. Paul's distinction between faith and hope: "faith accepts the present remission of sins; hope is the expectation of future deliverance" (Melanchthon). On the "modal" dative see Winer, § xxxi. 7, d.

*but hope that is seen.*] "**A hope**" means in this clause a thing hoped for (Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1; Acts xxviii. 20). When already present before the eyes it ceases to be an object of hope: for it is of the essence of hope that it looks not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen (Heb. xi. 1).

*for what a man seeth, why doth he* **also** *hope for?*] The actual sight and possession of the object leaves no room for hope properly so called. But if the object of our hope is unseen, then we naturally fall into the proper attitude of hope, and wait "**in patience**." On this sense of διά with the genitive, see notes on ii. 27, iv. 11, xiv. 20, and Winer, p. iii. § 47.

26, 27. THE PRESENT HELP OF THE SPIRIT.

This is the second ground of encouragement to wait patiently amid present suffering for the glory which shall be revealed: see on *v.* 18.

**26.** *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities.*] "**And in like manner** *the Spirit also helpeth our* **infirmity**." The passage refers not to "*infirmities*" in general, but particularly to "**infirmity**" under present suffering and waiting: this connexion with the preceding context is clearly shown by the word "*likewise* (ὡσαύτως)." As we on our part wait in patience, so on God's part there is the Holy Spirit joining His help with our weakness. The patient expectation, which follows from the nature of hope, would fail through our infirmity, if the latter were not sustained by the help of God's Spirit.

Van Hengel's interpretation of "*the Spirit*" as meaning the spirit of God's children, the trust and confidence with which the Holy Spirit inspires them, is excluded by such ex-

Digitized by Google

intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.

27 And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what *is* the mind of the Spirit, [1]because he maketh intercession for the saints according to *the will of* God.

28 And we know that all

[1] Or, that

pressions as "*the mind of the Spirit*," "*the Spirit maketh intercession for us*," which imply a person, and a person distinct from the believer himself.

Before proceeding to describe *how* the Spirit helpeth our infirmity the Apostle shows more fully the nature of that infirmity in reference to prayer. We know not what our prayer should be, for two reasons, because the future is still hidden, and even in the present life we know not what is best for us (Augustine).

*for we know not what we should pray for as we ought.*] "**for what to pray according to our need, we know not.**" The use of the Greek Article is noticeable: it turns the question "What should we pray?" into an Objective Sentence dependent on οὐκ οἴδαμεν. We know not the—what to pray, &c. The construction is characteristic of St. Paul and St. Luke: see Luke i. 62; ix. 46; xix. 48; xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24, 37; Acts iv. 24; xxii. 30; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; Eph. iv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 1. "*What we should pray for*" is less correct than "**What we should pray,**" *i.e.* what our prayer should be: compare Luke xviii. 11; Phil. i. 9; 1 Kings viii. 30, 48; 2 Kings xix. 20. "**According to our need**": the Greek adverb does not refer to the *manner* of praying, but to the correspondence between the prayer and that which is really needed.

Pythagoras forbade his disciples to pray for themselves, because they knew not what was expedient. Socrates more wisely taught his disciples to pray simply for good things, the Gods knowing best what sort of things are good (Xen. 'Mem. Socratis,' I. ii. 20). But better illustrations of St. Paul's meaning are found in his own experience, recorded in Philipp. i. 22, 23. "*What I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ;*" and in the experience of Our Lord Himself, "*Now is my soul troubled: and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name*" (John xii. 27, 28).

*but the Spirit itself.*] Observe the climax: the whole creation groans together: we ourselves, though we have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves: nay more, the Holy Spirit Himself intercedes for us with groanings.

Thus the ascending order of thought, the emphatic form "**the Spirit himself,**" and the phrase "*maketh intercession for us,*" show that neither the sanctified human spirit, nor any spiritual gift, such as the gift of prayer and intercession, can satisfy the Apostle's meaning. It is the Holy Ghost himself that intercedes, and that with groanings which are His, inasmuch as they are prompted by Him and express "*the mind of the Spirit.*" Yet St. Paul does not represent the Holy Spirit, as Jesus is represented by St. John, "*groaning within himself.*" "It is not in Himself, not in the substance of the Eternal and Blessed Trinity, but it is in us that He groans, because He makes us groan" (August. Tract. in Joh. vi. 2).

*with groanings which cannot be uttered.*] Or—"with speechless groanings." "Not in words but in groans doth the Spirit make intercession for the Saints, and in such groans as cannot be uttered in words. For how can language express what God's Spirit speaks to God, when sometimes even our own spirit cannot explain in words what it feels and thinks?" (Origen).

St. Paul means certainly more than any merely human emotion, however deep and holy; the groanings of the Holy Spirit cannot be uttered in the language of earth, nor His meaning fully known to man. The believer himself is conscious that he cannot express in words the infinite hopes and longings that he feels. But God is "He that searcheth the hearts" of men and knows all that is done there: and the heart, regarded as the seat of spiritual as well as natural life is the sphere of the Spirit's working: there He intercedes for us, using the heart as the instrument of His appeal to God; and so God "*knoweth what is the mind* (or "meaning, φρόνημα) *of the Spirit*": compare *v.* 6.

**27.** *because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.*] "*because* **according to God's will he maketh intercession for saints.**" Literally, "according to God," as in 2 Cor. viii. 9, 10, "**sorrow according to God.**" These words (κατὰ Θεόν) are placed first because they are emphatic.

"**for saints:**" the absence of the Article brings out the essential quality.

Thus the clause combines two reasons in one, why God must know what the meaning of the Spirit is: for (1) His intercession is in accordance with God's own will and purpose, "*for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God*" (1 Cor. ii. 10),

Digitized by Google

things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose.

---

and (2) His intercession is "*for* **saints**," and saints, as such, are the special objects of the Divine purpose, in accordance with which the Spirit intercedes. The two thoughts thus combined, God's purpose on behalf of saints, form the theme of the next paragraph.

### 28–30. The all-embracing Purpose of God's Love.

To the inward comfort which the Holy Spirit imparts to God's children, St. Paul now adds a third and last ground of encouragement, our knowledge that in the Divine government of the world all things contribute to the welfare of those who love God: even the troubles therefore of this life, so far from hindering our salvation, help it forward.

**28.** *all things.*] *I.e. all*, whether prosperous or adverse, *all* including "*the sufferings of this present time.*" The context requires this especial reference to sufferings.

The reading "God worketh all things," has less authority, and is not so well suited to the context.

*work together.*] Not merely does the joint and combined working of the whole result in a preponderance of good, but adverse circumstances as well as prosperous, each and all, conduce to good. See the Additional Note.

"When he says 'all things,' he means even things that seem to be painful. For even if affliction, poverty, imprisonment, hunger, death, or any other thing should come upon thee, God is able to turn all these the contrary way. Since this also is part of His ineffable power, to make what things seem troublesome light to us, and turn them to our help" (Chrysostom).

*for good.*] Not only their future and eternal happiness, but all that now supports and helps them on the way to attain it is included in the term "*good.*"

*to them that love God.*] The importance of this condition is marked in the Greek by its emphatic position at the beginning of the clause. "Love causes believers to take all things that God sends them favourably and in good part" (Bengel). See Ecclesiasticus xxxix. 27, "*All these things are for good to the godly; so to the sinners they are turned into evil.*" God Himself is man's chief good, and the love of God is thus a necessary condition for the full enjoyment of His gifts, whether temporal or eternal; in other words, they are prepared for those who love Him (see 1 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Ja. i. 12, ii. 5; and Hooker, 'E. P.' I. xi. 2).

*to them who are the called according to his purpose.*] This second description of the same class of persons is not a correction or limitation of the previous definition "*them that love God,*" but a statement of the cause why all things work together for their good, namely, that they "*who love God*" are the very class of persons who are "*called according to his purpose.*" Their love of God is a necessary *condition*, but God's own *purpose*, working efficaciously *in* and *for* those who are called in accordance with it, is the *cause* that makes all things work together for their good. The *purpose* being that of Him "*who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will*" (Eph. i. 11), it follows that all must work for good to them who are called according to that purpose. It is strange that so enlightened an interpreter as Chrysostom should understand by "*purpose*" nothing more than the will or purpose of man assenting to the outward call. For the true meaning compare ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9.

The contrast between the "*many called*" and "*few chosen*" (Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14), is found only in our Lord's own teaching. The word "*called*" (κλητός) is applied by St. Paul only to those who have, as far as man can judge, obeyed the call: its use thus corresponds to that of "*elect*," "*saints*," with which it is sometimes combined. See i. 6, 7; 1 Cor. i. 2, 24; Jude i.; Apoc. xvii. 14. Moreover, those "*who love God*" have in themselves the witness that they are "called according to His purpose," the call has produced its right effect, and the moral condition for further progress is satisfied. The Apostle thus begins with what is known and practical, and his subsequent statements in *vv.* 29, 30, are distinctly limited to those individuals in whom these practical results are found. These positive results already realised he traces back to their eternal cause, in order to show that the steps still to be accomplished (glorification, &c.) are guaranteed by those already made, all being links in the sure chain of an unfailing and eternal purpose. That purpose, as traced out in the following verses, has its eternal foundation in foreknowledge and predestination, its temporal realisation in the Divine acts of calling and justifying, and its eternal fulfilment in glory. Compare Leighton on 1 Pet. i. 2: "The connexion of these we are now for our profit to take notice of: that *effectual calling* is inseparably tied to this eternal *foreknowledge* or *election* on

Digitized by Google

29 For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be* conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

---

the one side, and to *salvation* on the other. These two links of the chain are up in heaven in God's own hand; but this middle one is let down to earth into the hearts of His children, and they laying hold on it, have sure hold on the other two, for no power can sever them."

**29-30.** At this point St. Paul passes from the province of Christian experience to that of Divine Philosophy. As we follow him, let us bear in mind the wise caution of Hooker (I. ii. 2): "Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High: whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of His name; yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know Him not as indeed He is, neither can know Him; and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach."

On a path so high and slippery for human reason our safety lies in planting our steps only where the inspired Apostle has already planted his: if we venture, as too many have ventured, beyond the limits of his track, there are precipices and chasms on every side, which the most wary can hardly escape.

It is well therefore to notice in the outset that the Apostle's statements in this passage are limited to the class of persons already doubly defined (1) as those who love God, and (2) as those who are called according to His purpose. His whole subject is their predestination to glory: no opposite view concerning the ungodly, no doctrine of an eternal reprobation, is even suggested.

**29.** The confidence expressed in *v.* 28 "*that all things work together for good to them that love God*" is now justified and confirmed (γάρ) by an explanation of the mode in which God's purpose concerning them is developed. For that purpose includes all the stages in the process of salvation, and these are so linked together that where one has taken place the rest must follow, from the unity of the Divine purpose and the continuity of its working.

And since God's love has thus secured the final happiness of "*those who are called according to His purpose*," nothing really hurtful can happen to them even in this life: afflictions are nothing else but the means by which they are "*to be conformed to the image of his Son*" in sufferings as in glory (*v.* 17).

*For whom he did foreknow.*] The many various senses here attributed to the Divine foreknowledge may be classed somewhat as follows:—

(1) "Foreknew"—simply as persons to come into existence hereafter.

This is too general and vague, because *all* are thus foreknown, while the foreknowledge here meant is limited to the particular persons who become predestinated, called, &c.

(2) "Foreknew"—as good and worthy to be known, *i.e.* approved: so Origen.

Or, "foreknew" as those who would believe and obey the call (Augustine's earlier view: 'Propos. ex Ep. ad. Rom. lv.': "nec praedestinavit aliquem nisi quem praescivit crediturum et secuturum vocationem suam, quos et electos dicit").

These and other like interpretations, which make faith, obedience, or moral worth the object of the Divine foreknowledge here meant, are rightly rejected as adding an idea which is contained neither in the word προέγνω nor in the context.

Meyer's interpretation—"foreknew as those who should one day become conformed to the image of his Son"—is in like manner to be rejected as adding an idea which has not yet been presented in the preceding context, and which cannot be ascribed to προέγνω without destroying the distinction between it and προώρισεν.

(3) "Foreknew" is taken as equivalent to "fore-ordained," knew and adopted them as His own, of His own free love and absolute decree (Calvin, Leighton, Haldane).

The objections to this third interpretation are:—

(*a*) That it is not supported by the usage of the word.

(*b*) That it identifies and confounds two ideas which Scripture keeps distinct, foreknowledge and election, *e.g.* 1 Pet. i. 2, "*elect according to the foreknowledge of God.*"

(4) "Foreknew" as the individual objects of His purpose (πρόθεσις), and therefore foreknew as "*them that love God:*" see notes on *v.* 28.

This interpretation introduces nothing that is not already found in the *preceding* context, and retains the simple and proper meaning of προέγνω. Nor is it open to any charge of making human *merit* the ground of God's election; for the love which He foreknew is but the answer to *His love* poured out in the heart by His Spirit (v. 5).

"Foreknowledge" is the act of conscious *perception*, without which there can be no *volition*. Augustine makes a clear distinction: "there can be no predestination without foreknowledge: but there may be fore-

Digitized by Google

30 Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

31 What shall we then say to these things? If God *be* for us, who *can be* against us?

32 He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

---

knowledge without predestination: God may foreknow also things which He does not Himself do" ('De Prædest. Sanctorum,' x.)

God's eternal purpose embraces all stages in salvation from first to last. His *foreknowledge defines persons* as the objects of that purpose not arbitrarily, but as included in the class of "*them that love God*"; His election, actuated by love, *chooses* those *persons* [not expressed in *this* passage]; His *predestination* determines what He will do for them.

*he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.*] The Divine predestination is in the New Test. always qualified, as here, by a statement of its end and aim: compare Acts iv. 28; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5, 11. See the Additional Note.

By "*the image of his Son*" is not meant the example or pattern of Christ's sufferings (Calvin), or of His holy obedience, but the embodiment of the Divine and human natures in the Incarnate Word. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Col. i. 15, iii. 10.

Of that Divine Image each glorified saint will be a particular form: and conformity to that Image in body, soul, and spirit is "*the glory which shall be revealed in us*" (*v.* 18), as the result of God's predestination.

But the full and final aim of that predestination, reaching beyond us to Christ, is "*that He might be the firstborn among many brethren*," not standing in His "sole glory" as the only begotten Son of God, but making us His brethren by a new creation, and so "*bringing many sons unto glory*." (Compare Col. i. 15, 18; Heb. i. 6, ii. 10, 11.)

**30.** *Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called.*] We here pass from the eternal counsel in its ideal process to its realisation in time. Here also three Divine acts are specified,—he "called," "justified," "glorified."

"*Called*," *i.e.* by the preaching of the Gospel, as in 2 Thess. ii. 14, "*Whereunto he called you by our gospel.*" But the usage of the verb in this sense, like that of κλητός, seems to be limited by the context to the cases of effectual calling: here certainly it is so. Compare Reuss, 'Théologie chrétienne,' ii. 120.

Such a calling is of necessity followed by justification, even as justification by glorification. Otherwise God's foreknowledge and predestination would be falsified. The Aorist "represents the future glorification as so necessary and certain that it appears as if already given and completed with the ἐδικαίωσεν." (Meyer, who refers to Herm. Vig. p. 747.) Rather, the Aorist has the same sense in all the clauses: it represents each act as complete (and therefore certain) *without determining* (ἀόριστος) its relative time whether Past, Present, or Future. This admirably serves "the triumphant flow of the great chain of thought, and the thoroughly Pauline boldness of expression." (Meyer.)

31–39. THE BLESSEDNESS OF THE ELECT.

The doctrine implied in *v.* 28, and developed in *vv.* 29, 30, is now applied to the encouragement of the believer.

"The inspired faith of the Apostle, leaving all earthly things far down below his feet, reflects itself in the sublimity of the language." (Philippi.)

**31.** *What shall we then say to these things?*] Rather, as in vi. 1, vii. 1. "*What shall we* **say then**," &c. Looking at these things, the revealed purpose of God and all the sure steps of its fulfilment, what inference shall we draw?

"*If God be* (rather, '**is**') *for us*," (as these things plainly show) *who can be against us?* This is the first of a stream of rapid and exulting questions, in which the Apostle cannot wait for any formal answer.

**32.** *He that spared not his own Son.*] This "climax of God's mercies" (Theodoret), the strongest of all proofs that "*God is for us*," is brought forward with an emphasis (ὅς γε) that we cannot imitate, as the sure ground of the question that follows. The allusion to Gen. xxii. 12, 16, is too close to be accidental: St. Paul uses the very word (ἐφείσατο, "*spared*") which the LXX. use concerning Abraham. This expression proves incidentally, but most clearly, that St. Paul regarded the Son of God as being *of one nature with the Father:* otherwise where would be the force of the comparison with the human father who withheld not his only son.

"Thus has God Himself fulfilled that which in Abraham's symbolic offering He acknowledged as the highest possible proof of love." (Philippi.)



Digitized by Google

33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? *It is* God that justifieth.

34 Who *is* he that condemneth? *It is* Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

35 Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? *shall* tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?

36 As it is written, [b]For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

[b] Ps. 44. 22.

37 Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.

---

*delivered him up.*] *I.e.* to death: see iv. 25.

*how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?*] The greatest and most costly gift ensures all the rest that depend on it, all the things (τὰ πάντα) that God has promised to us in Christ. To give freely (χαρίζεσθαι) is agreeable to God's nature: to deliver up his Son to death, and not to spare Him, was the greatest sacrifice God could make for man. Thus the argument is like that in ch. v. 9, 10, where see notes.

**33–35.** The punctuation and division of verses in the A. V. must be slightly corrected, to bring out the rhythmic flow of thought and language in this noble passage. Still full of the thought of God's sure love, the Apostle asks triumphantly, "*Who shall lay* **any charge against** *God's elect?*" He makes answer to himself in another question: "*It is God that justifieth: Who is he that condemneth?*" And then, as if bounding on from one rock to another, he passes from the Father's love to that of the Son:

"*It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen,* **who is also** *at the right hand of God, Who also maketh intercession for us: Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?*"

This order is adopted by the early Greek commentators: and is confirmed by reference to the source of the Apostle's thoughts in Isaiah l. 8, 9, where we have the same parallelism: "*He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me?*" . . . "*Behold, the Lord God will help me; who is he that shall condemn me?*" It is the only order that fully preserves the simplicity, freedom, and vigour of this loftiest flight of Christian eloquence.

"*God's elect,*" as such (observe the absence of the article), need fear no accuser: it is God Himself, the Judge of all, that justifies them (*v.* 30); who then is there to condemn them?

In Isaiah it is Messiah Himself that thus speaks; a fact which makes St. Paul's rapid transition to the mention of Christ's love more easy and natural.

*It is Christ that died.*] St. Paul accumulates the proofs of love and power: of love, for "*it is Christ that died*" for our sins; of power, for He not only died, but also *is risen* for our justification; of power again, for it is the same Christ "*who is* **also** *at the right hand of God;*" and then, finally, of love still abiding, for it is He "*who also maketh intercession for us.*"

**35.** The sure inference from such proofs of both the will and power to save, is expressed in the triumphant question: "*Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?*"

By "*the love of Christ*" is meant, not our love to Him, but His love to us, of which the proofs have been given in *v.* 34. This sense is confirmed by *v.* 37, "*through him that loved us.*"

*shall tribulation, or distress.*] See on ii. 9. These things might cut off man's love from us, but cannot hinder Christ's love from reaching and saving us.

On the various reading see Additional Note.

**36.** *as it is written.*] Closely connected with the last word "*sword.*"

In the midst of his enumeration of sufferings and perils, suggested, doubtless by his own experience (2 Cor. vi. 4), St. Paul is reminded by the word "*sword,*" of a passage in Ps. xliv. 22, which describes the like sufferings of God's faithful people in an earlier age, and which the Apostle regards as typical of the persecutions to which the faithful are exposed in his own age. "But there is this remarkable difference between the tone of the Psalmist and the tone of the Apostle. The former cannot understand the chastening, and complains that God's heavy hand has been laid without cause upon His people: the latter can rejoice, in persecution also, and exclaim, '*Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors.*'" (Perowne). See notes on the 44th Psalm.

**37.** *Nay.*] Literally, "But." The negative answer is omitted as self-evident, and the question met at once by a directly contrary affirmation.

*we are more than conquerors.*] An excellent rendering, first introduced in the Geneva Bible, 1557. Compare 2 Cor. iv. 8–11, 17.

Digitized by Google

38 For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come,

39 Nor height, nor depth, nor

"A holy arrogance of victory, not selfish, but in the consciousness of the might of Christ" (Meyer). "More than conquerors? What is that? Why they (i. e. the adversaries are not only overcome and disarmed, but they are brought over to our faction; they war on our side." (Chillingworth, Serm. V. § 61.) "This is a new order of victory, to conquer by means of our adversaries" (Chrysostom).

*through him that loved us.*] This must refer to Christ, through whose inseparable love (*v.* 35) we are made conquerors.

The aorist points to His one greatest act of love, already mentioned in *v.* 34. Compare v. 6.

38. The answer given in *v.* 37 is now confirmed by a declaration of the Apostle's own personal conviction, that no power in heaven or earth, in time or in eternity, can separate us from the Divine love.

What St. Paul thus expresses is a moral conviction rather than a logical certainty. It may be asked, Cannot the believer fall away? Is not this implied in such cases as that of Demas, 2 Tim. iv. 10, and in St. Paul's own words, "*If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard*" (Col. i. 23)? The answer is well given by Godet: "In the moral life freedom has always its part, as it had from the first moment of believing. What St. Paul means is that nothing shall pluck us out of Christ's arms *against our will*, and as long as we refuse not ourselves to abide there: compare Joh. x. 28–30."

*neither death, nor life.*] The last point mentioned in the question (*vv.* 35, 36) is taken up first, "*death*," with its opposite, "*life*:" compare xiv. 8. The argument requires that the words should have their widest sense, as general states in one or other of which we must be found. Explanations such as "the fear of death, the love of life" (Grotius), or "death with its agonies, life with its distractions and temptations" (Godet), only limit the flight of the Apostle's thoughts just when they would soar above all limitations.

*nor angels, nor principalities,*] The angels mentioned in the N. T. are much more frequently the good than the evil; but the word itself never indicates the specific quality, either good or evil, this being either expressed, or at least implied, in the context. Meyer's assertion that "*angels*" used absolutely signifies nothing else than simply good angels, is arbitrary in such passages as Acts xxiii. 8, 1 Cor. iv. 9, and quite inadmissible in 1 Cor. vi. 3; Heb. ii. 16.

In our present passage "*angels*" and "*principalities*" must both have the widest possible application: the point in question is not the moral disposition, whether good or evil, but the power of the angelic order of created things.

"*Principalities*" are angels of greater power and might (Eph. vi. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 11).

*nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers.*] This seems the more natural order, "*powers*" being akin to "*principalities*" (1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21): but the weight of ancient authority is in favour of a different arrangement:

"Neither death,[1] nor life,[2]
Nor angels,[3] nor principalities,[4]
Nor things present,[5] nor things to come,[6]
Nor powers,[7]
Nor height,[8] nor depth,[9]
Nor any other creature.[10]"

"The principle of arrangement would seem to be, to place alternately inanimate and animate objects, reserving '*creature*,' which sums up the whole to the last line, in order to denote that 'the dominion over all the works of God's hands,' originally designed for man (Gen. i. 26; Ps. viii. 6), which he had lost by having bowed down to and 'served the creature' (Rom. i. 25), should now, through his union with Christ Jesus, be restored to him, 'all things being put in subjection under his feet,' Heb. ii. 8" (Forbes). If the order has this significance, it may be attributed to St. Paul's familiarity with Hebrew poetry, in which the most perfect parallelism is often found in passages of the most fervid eloquence.

Meyer arranges the *ten* in two *pairs*, followed by two *threes*.

*nor things present, nor things to come.*] No dimensions of time: "*nor height, nor depth*;" no dimensions of space.

These abstractions bring out the idea of universality more emphatically, and suit the rhetorical character of the passage better than any more limited expressions, such as "heaven or earth," "heaven or hell," by which some would interpret them.



Digitized by Google

any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

*nor any other creature.*] No state, no being, no power, nor property, such as those already mentioned, "nor any other created thing," in short, nothing in the created universe, "*shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*" Origen, in Cramer's 'Catena,' p. 156, suggests another interpretation of the words (κτίσις ἑτέρα): "But if besides this whole visible creation there is another creation, which though in nature visible is as yet unseen, you will ask whether to that may be referred the saying '*nor any other creation shall be able to separate us from the love of God.*'" In support of this view Origen refers to Ephes. i. 21, where Christ is seated "*far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.*" A very similar interpretation is approved by Chrysostom, as well suited to the sublimity of the passage.

*the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*] These last words teach us that "Christ's love" (*v.* 35) is no other than "God's love" manifested to us, and operating on our behalf in the Person of Christ: see Note on v. 8.

This noble hymn of victory (*vv.* 31–39), while growing naturally out of its immediate context (*vv.* 28–30), and having a primary reference to the sure triumph of them that love God, forms at the same time a grand conclusion to the whole doctrinal portion of the Epistle. "It is the crown of that edifice of salvation in Christ, of which St. Paul had laid the foundation in his demonstration of *the righteousness of faith* (i.–v.) and raised the superstructure in his exposition of *sanctification* (vi.–viii.). After this it will only remain for us to see the salvation, thus studied in its essence, unfold itself upon the stage of history" (Godet).

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 2, 3, 9, 11, 28, 29, 35.

**2.** For ἠλευθέρωσέ με Tischendorf (8) reads ἠλευθέρωσεν σέ, with B ℵ F G. Tertullian's reading varies: he has "te" in 'De Pudicitiâ,' c. 17, but "me" in 'De Resurrectione Carnis,' c. 46. The First Person is much more natural in the connexion with c. VII., and σέ may have come from the last syllable of ἠλευθέρωσεν.

Here then, as below in *v.* 35, it must be admitted that the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., notwithstanding their general excellence, give an inferior reading.

**3.** *a.* It is generally agreed that τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου is a nominative absolute (cf. Eur. 'Troad.' 489) in apposition to the sentence, ὁ Θεὸς κατέκρινεν, κ.τ.λ.

But ἀδύνατος is sometimes active, "unable" (Acts xiv. 8; Rom. xv. 1), and sometimes passive, "impossible" (Matt. xix. 26; Heb. vi. 4, 18; x. 4).

The passive sense, "that which was impossible to the law," is well paraphrased in the A. V., "*that which the law could not do,*" and is preferred by Meyer and Alford.

The objection to it is that St. Paul would have written τὸ ἀδύνατον τῷ νόμῳ, instead of τὸ ἀδ. τοῦ νόμου. Of this latter combination, the passive ἀδύνατον and the genitive, no examples have been brought forward; for in all the passages quoted by Meyer in support of the passive sense, the active is evidently required.

Plato, 'Hipp. Maj.' p. 295, E: οὐκοῦν τὸ δυνατὸν ("that which is able") ἕκαστον ἀπεργάζεσθαι, εἰς ὅπερ δυνατόν, εἰς τοῦτο καὶ χρήσιμον, τὸ δὲ ἀδύνατον ("but that which is unable") ἄχρηστον.

Xen. 'Hell.' I. iv. 13: ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως δυνατοῦ ("from his own resources and from the ability of the city"): see Breitenbach's note.

Epistle to Diognetus, c. ix. C. Ἐλέγξας . . . τὸ ἀδύνατον τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ζωῆς. The active sense is strongly confirmed by the similar phrase τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ in ix. 22.

With the active sense the construction may be thus explained: "For the impotence of the law being this, that it could not condemn sin in the flesh, God did condemn sin in the flesh," &c.

*b.* ἐν ᾧ, "*in that,*" A. V. a much better rendering than "because" (Alford). It points to that *in which* the inability of the law consists, namely in its being overpowered by the opposition of "*the flesh*" (vii. 14–18). Compare Plato, 'Rep.' V. p. 455: τὸν μὲν εὐφυῆ πρός τι εἶναι τὸν δὲ ἀφυῆ ἐν ᾧ ὁ μὲν ῥᾳδίως τι μανθάνει, ὁ δὲ χαλεπῶς.

*c.* ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. The consistency of this expression with the reality and the sinlessness of Christ's Flesh is ably defended by Tertullian ('Contra Marcionem.' V. 14; 'De Carne Christi,' xvi., xvii.), and

Digitized by Google

by Augustine, who shews how Christ's flesh was sinless on either hypothesis of Traducianism or Creatianism (Epist. 164).

This ancient interpretation, accepted even by Baur ('Paulus,' III. c. viii.), has been elaborately attacked by Pfleiderer as involving "two errors: a mistranslation of the word ὁμοίωμα, and an inadmissible separation of the two ideas σάρξ and ἁμαρτίας. As regards the first, it is beyond question, that if the words had merely been ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός, no one would have hesitated to translate them simply 'in fleshly shape,' that is to say, in a shape or form of appearance which was the same as that of all human flesh, and in fact consisted of flesh" ('Paulinism,' I. p. 52).

In this bold assertion grammar and sense are alike put to confusion. The Objective Genitive is turned into a Genitive of the Material: σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας "denotes" (we are told) "the material of which the human form of Christ, like that of other men, consists" (*ib.*).

If we apply this method to Deut. iv. 18, ὁμοίωμα παντὸς ἑρπετοῦ, it will turn "*the graven image*" itself into "a creeping likeness;" and in Ps. cvi. 20 ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἐσθίοντος χόρτον, the calf that Aaron made of gold becomes an actual living "*calf that eateth hay.*"

We prefer the opinion of "most of the commentators, who explain the decisive passage in Rom. viii. 3 as if it meant that Christ appeared only in a '*likeness of sinful flesh*,' that is to say, in a body which resembled indeed the body of other men so far as it consisted of flesh, but was unlike them in this respect that His flesh was *not* like that of all others, '*sinful flesh*'" (ib.).

Other objections are urged both by Pfleiderer and Holsten:

(1.) The sinlessness of Christ's flesh directly contradicts this passage: for how could God have condemned "*sin in the flesh*" on the Cross of Christ, if Christ's flesh was not "flesh of sin"?

This objection rests wholly on the erroneous connexion of ἐν τῇ σαρκί noticed below in note *e*.

(2). It is opposed to the whole development of thought from vi. 1 to viii. 3, which labours to prove that because man is in bondage to sin *only through his flesh*, he is delivered by the Cross of Christ just because it is *the death of this very flesh of sin*.

It is enough to answer that St. Paul nowhere attempts to prove that man is in bondage to sin *only through his flesh*.

(3). St. Paul's whole anthropology recognises *no flesh* that is *not flesh of sin*.

This objection rests on the same groundless assumption as the preceding (2): see note on σάρξ, Introduction, § 9.

For a full discussion of Holsten's objections and of the whole subject, see Wendt, 'Fleisch und Geist.'

*d.* καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Chrysostom and others, disregarding καί, connect these words with κατέκρινεν, in the sense "condemned sin for sin," *i. e.* as being exceeding sinful.

All the English Versions in Bagster's Hexapla (except Geneva) give the same connexion, the A. V. 1611 being punctuated (as it is in a chained copy at Walgrave) thus: "*, and for sinne condemned sin in the flesh*," with the marginal rendering, "and by a sacrifice for sin," which corresponds with Origen's interpretation.

The proper connexion with πέμψας is given by Theophylact, Gennadius, Photius, and others in Cramer's 'Catena,' with the interpretations "because of sin's mastery over mankind," or "in order to conquer sin." The more comprehensive rendering "on account of sin" (propter peccatum) is preferable.

*e.* The words τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί might possibly be taken as forming one idea, "the sin that was in the flesh," as τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον (vi. 4): see Winer, p. 169.

But the words ἐν τῇ σαρκί in this construction only give a definition of sin which is not needed in this context after σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, whereas if joined with κατέκρινε they are full of significance.

It remains to be determined *in what flesh* sin was condemned, and *how?* The answers are various.

i. *Origen.* In Christ's flesh, considered as a sin-offering which put away sin (Heb. ix. 26).

ii. *Gennadius*, in Cramer's 'Catena,' p. 123.

(a) In Christ's flesh, as having been kept free from sin, and unconquered by it.

(b) In Christ's flesh God condemned sin *of sin* (περὶ ἁμαρτίας, de peccato), because it unjustly involved Christ's sinless flesh in death.

All these interpretations would require ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ to distinguish Christ's flesh from that which has been twice before mentioned, διὰ τῆς σαρκός, and σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. They err, however, only in substituting the more limited sense "his flesh" for the more general "the flesh." Christ's holy life "*condemned sin*" as unworthy to exist "*in the flesh*" which He and all men had in common: compare Irenæus, III. xx. 2.

9. Though εἴπερ implies a more confident assumption than εἴγε, it cannot possibly mean "since" (ἐπείπερ, Chrysostom), for that would exclude the opposite supposition which is expressly brought forward in the following clause, εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει. The assumption made in either case

Digitized by Google

may or may not correspond to the existing fact, not because the fact is itself *contingent*, but because it is *unknown* to the speaker.

This uncertainty of the assumption is fully expressed in "*if so be*," and the Subjunctive ought not to be repeated in the Verb "*dwell*," for in the original the Indicative Present (οἰκεῖ, οὐκ ἔχει) represents not *an uncertain contingency*, but that which, according to the assumption, is already *an existing fact*. Wiclif's rendering "**dwelleth**," "**hath**," is therefore more correct than the A. V. "*dwell*," "*have*," derived from Tyndale. In defending the Subjunctive, Bp. Ellicott ('On the Revision,' p. 175) fails to distinguish between *uncertainty in the assumption*, and *contingency* in the fact assumed: the case *is* contemplated, according to the hypothesis, as actually in existence.

**11.** In the Dialogues on the Holy Trinity, ascribed to Maximus, the Greek monk and confessor (A. D. 580-662), Orthodoxus, being challenged to prove that as the Father raises the dead and quickens them (ζωοποιεῖ), so also do the Son and Holy Ghost, quotes this passage with the reading διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος. Macedonius replies that the reading is διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν, except perhaps in one or two falsified copies. Orthodoxus asserts that the genitive is found in all the ancient copies, but, as this is considered by Macedonius to be a disputed point, passes on to a different argument.

This imaginary conversation only proves that in the 7th century the reading of the passage had long been in dispute, a fact of which we have abundant evidence of much earlier date. The genitive is found in ℵ A C, in many cursives, and some early versions, and Fathers. But this testimony is outweighed by that of other uncials and cursives, of the Italic and Syriac versions, and of the earlier Fathers, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Methodius.

This preponderance of external testimony is supported by the internal evidence:

(1) The argument of the passage, as stated by Bp. Pearson himself (see foot-note), is inconclusive, unless we substitute the reading "**because of** *his Spirit that dwelleth in you*": for it is nowhere implied in the premisses that Christ was raised up "*by the Spirit*."

(2) The resurrection is ascribed in the N. T. to God in general, or to the Father, or to the Son (John v. 21; vi. 39; xi. 25), but not to the Holy Ghost in particular.

(3) The genitive is more likely than the accusative to have been introduced for its dogmatic import, as proving the personality of the Holy Ghost.

It should, however, be observed that the accusative represents the indwelling Spirit not only as the condition, but as the cause of true vitality.

**28.** πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθὸν [ὁ Θεός]. Though supported by good authority (A. B. Æthiopic) ὁ Θεός is probably a gloss: both the form of the sentence and the sense are better without it.

The meaning of συνεργεῖ, "work together, one with another," preferred by Estius, Bengel, Reiche, and Alford, seems to have been rejected by other interpreters without sufficient reason. The Verb has this sense not only in the phrases συνεργεῖν ἀλλήλοιν (Xenoph. 'Memor. Socr.' II. iii. 88) συνεργεῖν ἑαυτοῖς (*ib.* III. v. 16), but also when there is no Dative expressed as in the passage of Diogenes Laertius (vii. 104) quoted by Fritzsche, διχῶς λέγεσθαι τὰ ἀδιάφορα· ἅπαξ μὲν τὰ μήτε πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν μήτε πρὸς κακοδαιμονίαν συνεργοῦντα. Compare Polybius, XI. ix. 1, where συνεργεῖν is quite synonymous with συμβάλλεσθαι.

**29.** The word προορίζω, not found in classical writers nor in the LXX, is always in the N. T. accompanied by words which indicate the end and aim of the predestination.

This aim is here expressed in the adjective συμμόρφους, a secondary predicate used proleptically as in Phil. iii. 21, where the words εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτό are a gloss added to explain the construction. For the use of συμμόρφους with the genitive, see Bernhardy, 'Syntax,' p. 163; Matt. 'G. Gr.' § 379, obs. 2.

**35.** For τοῦ Χριστοῦ B ℵ and some cursives read τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, a manifest interpolation from *v.* 39, and an undeniable instance in which the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. combine in giving a wrong reading. Compare Additional Note on *v.* 2.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER IX.

1 *Paul is sorry for the Jews.* 7 *All the seed of Abraham were not the children of the promise.* 18 *God hath mercy upon whom he will.* 21 *The potter may do with his clay what he list.* 25 *The calling of the Gentiles and rejecting of the Jews were foretold.* 32 *The cause why so few Jews embraced the righteousness of faith.*

I SAY the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost,

2 That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart.

3 For I could wish that myself were [1]accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh:

4 Who are Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the [1]covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service *of God*, and the promises;

[1] Or, *separated*

[1] Or, *testaments.*

---

CHAPTERS IX.-XI. ISRAEL'S UNBELIEF, REJECTION, AND FUTURE RESTORATION.

The argument that the Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (i. 16—viii. 39) closes in a strain of triumphant thanksgiving.

But with all the Apostle's joy in Christ's salvation there is mingled a great and unceasing sorrow. For in stating the theme of his great argument (i. 16) St. Paul had spoken of a "*salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.*" Why then have his brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh so little share in this salvation? Where is the promise that was made to the Jew first? In treating this subject St. Paul, after a fervent protestation of love and sorrow for his own people, (ix. 1-5) declares that the cause of their rejection is not a failure of God's promise to the chosen people Israel (6–13), nor any injustice in God (14–29), but their own rejection of "*the righteousness of God by faith*" (ix. 30—x. 21). Consolation is found in the salvation of a "*remnant according to election of grace*" (xi. 1–10), in the present acceptance of the Gentiles (11–22), and the future restoration of Israel (23–32), all which are proofs of the wisdom and glory of God (33–36).

CHAP. IX. 1–5. MOURNING OVER ISRAEL.

The sudden transition from triumphant joy to the keenest sorrow is made more striking by the absence of any connecting particle. But the direct connexion of thought with viii. 28–32 is evident. If the Gospel brings sure salvation to God's elect, why is His chosen people Israel not found among the heirs of this salvation?

1. *I say the truth in Christ, I lie not.*] **I speak truth. &c.** Compare 1 Tim. ii. 7. St. Paul's conflicts with Jews and Judaizers might cast doubt upon his love to his own nation. Hence he affirms the sincerity of his sorrow for them with the assurance that he speaks with all the truthfulnesss of one who feels that he is living and acting "*in Christ*" (Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1), and for whom it is therefore impossible to lie (Col. iii. 9; Eph. iv. 15).

*my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.*] Rather, *my conscience* **bearing witness with me.** The Holy Ghost is "*the Spirit of truth,*" and the witness of a conscience enlightened by Him and acting under His influence must be true. St. Paul's conscience bears witness with him, *i.e.* in accordance with his words, "*in the Holy Ghost,*" and therefore in all the clearness of divine truth. See note on ξυμμαρτυρεῖν, ii. 15; viii. 16.

2. The truth so solemnly attested in *v.* 1 is now expressed twice, and with growing intensity,—"great grief to me," "unceasing sorrow to my heart."

3. *For I could wish.*] The form of expression (ηὐχόμην, literally "I was wishing" or "praying") implies a real but passing wish, not calmly weighed and deliberately retained, but already resigned as impracticable (Acts xxv. 22; Gal. iv. 20; see Winer, III. § xli. 2).

*that myself were accursed from Christ.*] When the Apostle brings himself to utter the cause of his grief, his intense love and sorrow for Israel burst forth in words which might well seem incredible. His solemn protestation (*v.* 1) was not unnecessary, even if his affection for his countrymen had never been doubted.

*accursed.*] The meaning of the word "anathema" (1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9) is to be derived from its use by the LXX in Lev. xxvii. 28, 29: "*Every devoted thing* (ἀνάθεμα) *is most holy unto the Lord. None devoted* (ἀνάθεμα), *which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death.*"

Here the doom of the devoted one, instead of the death of the body, is separation from Christ and from the salvation that is in Him.

Like Moses St. Paul, if it depended only on his love, would have given his own soul for his brethren's sake, "if so he might bring

Digitized by Google

5 Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

---

them to true righteousness and eternal life" (Grotius).

But is not such a wish unreasonable and even irreverent? It must seem so to those whose hearts beat with no stronger pulse than that of a prudent self-interest. It is a fervent outburst of unselfish love, that may not be coldly criticised and weighed and measured: it is close akin to the spirit of Christ's self-sacrifice, and to that "*foolishness of God*" which "*is wiser than men.*"

"O mighty love, O unsurpassable perfection, the servant speaks boldly to his Lord, and begs remission for the people, or claims to be himself also blotted out with them" (Clemens Rom. i. 53).

4. *Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption.*] St. Paul's sorrow, springing from natural affection for his kinsmen according to the flesh, is deepened by another feeling, "inasmuch as they (οἵτινες) are Israelites" to whom belong all the privileges of the ancient covenant, which are now perfected "*in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ.*" How mournful then to see the heirs of the promise shut out from their inheritance!

First in the emphatic enumeration of the privileges of Israel is "*the adoption,*" which was first announced in Egypt:—*Israel is my son, even my firstborn*" (Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9). To Israel only had God thus revealed Himself as a Father, until "*the adoption*" was perfected in Christ (viii. 14–17).

*the glory.*] "*The glory of the Lord,*" which was seen on Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 16, 17), and filled the tabernacle, had the form of light or fire, covered at times by a cloud: see note on Ex. xl. 34. Israel alone had such a visible token of God's presence.

Such interpretations as "the national glory of Israel" (Fritzsche), or "the glory that will be theirs in the end of the world" (Reuss), are too vague to have place in an enumeration of the several distinguishing privileges of the Jews.

*and the covenants, and the giving of the law.*] In Gal. iv. 24 St. Paul speaks of "*two covenants, one from Mount Sinai:*" but here "*the giving of the law,*" the one grand revelation of the will of Jehovah for the regulation of the national and personal life of His people, is distinguished from "*the covenants*" made at several times with the fathers from Abraham downwards. (2 Macc. viii. 15; Sap. xviii. 22; Sirach xliv. 11; Heb. xi. 13.) So St. Paul speaks in Eph. ii. 12 of "*the commonwealth of Israel,*" a result of the giving of the law, and "*the covenants of the promise,*" as distinct privileges of Israel from which other nations had been excluded. The singular, found in many MSS, may have arisen from a wish to obviate the mistake of referring the plural to the old and new covenants mentioned in Gal. iv. 24.

*the service of God.*] "**The service**" of the Tabernacle (compare Heb. ix. 1) was the only worship which God had appointed.

*the promises.*] These, as distinguished from "*the covenants*" upon which they are grounded, include the whole body of prophecies concerning Christ and His kingdom.

5. *the fathers.*] Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Acts iii. 13, vii. 32): to have sprung from such forefathers, was one of the most cherished privileges of Israel (2 Cor. xi. 22).

*and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.*] The last and greatest privilege of the Israelites is that the Messiah, so far as His human nature is concerned, springs from their race. We must notice here the important distinctions so carefully expressed by St. Paul's words and even by their exact order: "and from whom came the Christ as concerning the flesh." Christ is not in the same sense as the Patriarchs the peculiar property of the Israelites, "whose (ὧν) *are the fathers.*" He springs indeed from their race (ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστός), but He "*is over all:*" and not only is His Jewish origin thus contrasted with His universal supremacy, but it is also expressly limited to His human nature. The closing emphasis of the clause falls upon the words "*as concerning the flesh,*" which point onward to their natural contrast in the other aspect of His Person, Who is "*God blessed for ever.*"

*who is over all, God blessed for ever.*] There is happily no variation in the MSS to cast any doubt upon the wording of this great passage. But the MSS have no marks of punctuation, and some modern critics adopt a different connexion. They assume that the words "God over all" are to be combined in this order as a title equivalent to "most High God," and asserting that St. Paul could not have applied this title to Christ, they deny that the clause refers to Him, and render it as a doxology: "May the God who is over all be blessed for ever." To this interpretation there are strong objections on grounds which are stated in *the note at the end of the chapter.* Here it may be enough to say that it gives a most inappropriate sense. St. Paul is expressing the anguish of his heart at the fall of his brethren: that anguish is deepened by the memory of their privileges, most of all by

Digitized by Google

6 Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they *are* not all Israel, which are of Israel:

7 Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, *are they* all children: but, [c] In Isaac shall thy seed be called.

[c] Gen. 21. 12.

8 That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

9 For this *is* the word of promise, [d] At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.

[d] Gen. 18. 10.

---

the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected. In this, the usual interpretation, all is most natural: the last and greatest cause of sorrow is the climax of glory from which the chosen race has fallen.

But how could such a lamentation close in a doxology? How could the Apostle bless God that Christ was born a Jew, in his anguish that the Jews had rejected Him?

On the other hand the declaration that Christ "*is over all, God blessed for ever*," is an opportune and noble protest against the indignity cast upon Him by the unbelief of the Jews. "For what, saith he, if others blaspheme? Yet we who know His unspeakable mysteries, and His ineffable wisdom, and His great providence, know that He is worthy not to be blasphemed but to be glorified" (Chrysostom).

6–13. NO FAILURE OF GOD'S PROMISE.

St. Paul's lamentation over his brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh has no such meaning as that God's promise has failed, for that belonged not to all natural descendants of Abraham, but only to the chosen seed, the true Israel.

6. *Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel.*] "**But not as though the word of God hath fallen to the ground: for not all they which are of Israel are Israel.**" "*The word of God*" is the promise given to Abraham and to his seed. This has not failed, for its principle from the first was not mere natural succession, but Divine election: not all who were sprung from the chosen people were therefore themselves the chosen people, true Israelites, heirs of the promise.

On this use of οὗτος see the note at the end.

7. *Neither because they are the seed of Abraham.*] "**Nor because they are Abraham's seed** *are they all children*:" *i.e.* children of Abraham in the fullest sense, as in viii. 17, "*if children, then heirs.*" St. Paul goes back to Abraham in order to discuss the case of his two sons, and to show that in the very first generation, the title of natural descent was limited and restricted by Divine election. In ratifying Sarah's claim that the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with her son, God says to Abraham (Gen. xxi. 12), "*In Isaac shall thy seed be called*," *i. e.* the promised seed (Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 5, xvii. 7. 19); and then adds, "*and also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed.*" Thus in using the term "*seed of Abraham*" in a twofold sense, here and in other passages, St. Paul only adopts a distinction which belonged to the promise from the first.

8. *That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.*] "*That is,* **Not the children of the flesh are thereby children** *of God.*" St. Paul interprets the text just quoted, by drawing out the general principle involved in the particular case of Ishmael the child of the flesh, and Isaac the child of promise. According to the A. V. none of "*the children of the flesh*" are "*children of God*:" in other words "*the children of the flesh*" do not include all the descendants of Abraham, but only those who are "*children of the flesh*" and nothing more. But the Greek idiom absolutely requires a different meaning, which we have tried to express above. The true "*children*" of Abraham are "*children of God*" by virtue of the adoption, *v.* 4. But *who* are these? Not "*the children of the flesh*" as such. See Note at end.

*but the children of the promise.*] This does not mean simply the promised children, but as Chrysostom says of Isaac, "It was not the power of the flesh, but *the strength of the promise* that gave birth to the child." It would be equally true to say that the child was begotten in *the strength of faith*, but the argument requires the Divine, not the human, side to be made prominent. It is not Abraham's fatherhood that determines the true seed, but that promise which was the expression of God's free electing grace. It is clear from Gal. iv. 28 that "*the children of the promise*" correspond, in the Apostle's mind, to believers, whether Jew or Gentile, and "*the children of the flesh*" to the unbelieving Jews.

*are counted for the seed.*] And therefore really are what they are by God accounted: compare iv. 5, and note there.

9. *For this is the word of promise.*] St. Paul confirms his statement by God's words to Abraham in Gen. xviii. 14. "*The children,*"

Digitized by Google

10 And not only *this;* but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, *even* by our father Isaac;

11 (For *the children* being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)

12 It was said unto her, The [a][1]elder shall serve the [1]younger.

13 As it is written, [b]Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.

14 What shall we say then? *Is*

[a] Gen. 25. 23. [1] Or, *greater.* [1] Or, *lesser.* [b] Mal. 1. 2.

---

I say, "*of the promise,*" "**for this word is (a word) of promise.**"

*At this time.*] "**According to this season:**" see note on Gen. xviii. 10.

**10.** *And not only this.*] Translate: "**And not only she, but Rebecca also, when she had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac.**" The construction is incomplete, but the sense is clear. Not only Sarah received a promise from God, which limited the true seed of Abraham to her son: but in the next generation Rebecca also received a promise, in which the same principle of Divine election is still more strikingly proved.

Isaac, it might be said, was the only child of Abraham by his wife, "*the free woman*" (Gal. iv. 22), and so the only proper heir: but Esau and Jacob were *twin* children *of one father*, which is expressly mentioned in order to exclude all possibility of difference in parentage. Abraham's sons had only *one* common parent, Rebecca's have *both.*

*even by our father Isaac.*] The twins had for their common father the patriarch of the chosen race: and yet even in this case one of them, and he the first-born, was excluded. This case comes home more fully to the Jews than the rejection of the slave-born Ishmael.

**11.** *(For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)*] The parenthesis is not only useless, but destroys the connection with the following verse. The conditional negatives (μήπω, μηδέ) represent the circumstances not as mere facts of history, but as conditions entering into God's counsel and plan. The time of the prediction was thus chosen, in order to make it clear that He who calls men to be heirs of His salvation makes free choice of whom He will, unfettered by any claims of birth or merit. Such absolute freedom is the rightful prerogative of Him, who is alone All-wise and All-good. The order of the clauses is very significant: the time chosen for the prediction to Rebecca is mentioned first—"**while the children were** *not yet born*, **nor had done aught** *good or evil;*" then the Divine counsel in choosing this time, "*that the purpose of God according to election might stand not* **dependent on** *works but* **on** *him that calleth;*" and last the principal sentence, "*it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.*"

*might stand*] Literally, "might remain." The Present Tense extends this continuance even to the Apostle's own generation, in which the principle was again so signally and so sadly exemplified.

**12, 13.** *The elder shall serve the younger.*] The whole passage in Gen. xxv. 23 is as follows: "*Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels: and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger.*"

This prediction, St. Paul says, agrees with what is written in Malachi i. 2: "*I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste.*"

(1.) From the context of both passages it is clear that Esau and Jacob are regarded as two *nations*, and it is an arbitrary assumption to say that Malachi intends not the two nations, Edom and Israel, but the persons of the two brothers.

(2.) But it is also clear from the words "*while they were not yet born,*" *v.* 11, that St. Paul regards them as individual *persons.*

(3.) The explanation, which combines both views, is that the choice of the nation is included in the choice of its founder, and the original passages refer to God's election of *Jacob and his descendants* to be the depositaries of His truth and the channels of His grace. What St. Paul shows is, that the election to these privileges was not dependent on any personal merit of the founder.

*Esau have I hated.*] See the notes on Malachi i. 3. The love and the hate, as contemplated by St. Paul, are shown in God's choosing the younger to inherit the Messianic promise, and excluding the elder.

The exaggerated sense of "positive hate" which Meyer assigns to ἐμίσησα is quite forbidden by the record of the ample blessing bestowed on Esau.

### 14–18. No Injustice in God.

Having shown from the history of the

Digitized by Google

*there* unrighteousness with God? God forbid.

15 For he saith to Moses, [c] I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.

[c] Ex. 33. 19.

16 So then *it is* not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.

17 For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, [d] Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I

[d] Ex. 9. 16.

---

Patriarchs that the present exclusion of the Jews from Christ's kingdom does not imply a failure of God's promise, St. Paul now proceeds to prove that it cannot be ascribed to injustice in God.

The rejection of Ishmael and Esau with their descendants, and the choice of Israel to inherit the promised blessing, were examples of God's electing grace, which a Jew would heartily approve. But what if these examples involved a principle that would justify the exclusion of the unbelieving Jew himself? To such a conclusion, clearly implied in *v.* 11, objection would at once be made.

**14.** *What shall we say then?*] From the account given in *vv.* 11–13 of the choice of Jacob and rejection of Esau before they had done either good or evil, the question naturally arises "*Is there injustice in God,*" that He thus chooses one and rejects another without regard to their works? "The Jewish conscience, developed under the Law, was accustomed to consider the conduct of God towards man as depending entirely on the merit or demerit of his works" (Godet). The ground on which St. Paul rejects the thought of injustice is remarkable. His answer is simply an appeal to the testimony of Holy Scripture that God *does* exercise His mercy with absolute freedom of choice: the force therefore of his argument rests wholly on the very principle presupposed in the objection, "God cannot be unjust." Neither the truth of this axiom nor the authority of Scripture could be questioned by a Jew. For a similar argument, and for the form of the question, in which the negative answer is already implied, see iii. 5 and note.

**15.** *For he saith to Moses.*] "**For to Moses he saith.**" The order of the words is emphatic. "It was necessary to mention Moses, in order to show the certainty of the statement by the persons both of Him who spake and of him who heard" (Theodoret). But more than this is implied: if to *Moses* God's favour was absolutely free and unmerited, how much more to others!

*I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy.*] Ex. xxxiii. 19: where "these words, though only connected with the previous clause by the copulative Vau, are to be understood in a causal sense as expressing the reason why Moses' request was granted, namely, that it was an act of unconditional grace and compassion on the part of God, to which no man, not even Moses, could lay any just claim" (Keil and Delitzsch).

See the note at the end of the chapter on other interpretations.

**16.** *So then it is not of him that willeth.*] The inference from God's words to Moses is, that the bestowal of the Divine mercy depends not on man's will or man's effort, but simply on "*God that sheweth mercy.*" He chooses whom He will, and on what conditions He will. His grace is a free gift, not a debt: it calls out man's will and effort, but is not predetermined by them (Phil. ii. 13). For the expression "*him that runneth*" compare 1 Cor. ix. 24–26.

**17.** St. Paul appeals again to Scripture to prove as a fact that God does reject, as well as choose, whomsoever He will. It is still presupposed, as in *v.* 14, that "God cannot be unjust:" if Holy Scripture testifies that "*he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth,*" then this must be true, and it must also be consistent with God's justice. The fact is first shown from Scripture (*vv.* 17–18), and then its justice is discussed (*vv.* 19–24).

*Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up.*] Rather "*for this* **very** *purpose,*" &c.

The sense of the passage as understood by the LXX is as follows: "For this purpose I have upheld thee, and preserved thy life, that I might show my power in thee by a long series of warnings and chastisements, followed by a final great overthrow, more strikingly than it could have been shown by thy immediate destruction." This interpretation represents fairly, though not precisely, the general meaning of the Hebrew, and being not unsuited to the present stage of St. Paul's argument, is adopted by him, with the following slight but very important variation.

For *ἵνα*, which expresses the direct and primary purpose, "in order that," St. Paul substitutes *ὅπως* denoting the more remote and secondary purpose, "that so."

Thus the exhibition of God's power upon Pharaoh appears only as the secondary purpose, consequent on his refusal to yield to God's direct will, "Let my people go."

The more exact meaning of the passage

Digitized by Google

might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.

18 Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will *have mercy*, and whom he will he hardeneth.

19 Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?

20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that [1]repliest against God? [e]Shall the thing formed say to him that formed *it*, Why hast thou made me thus?

21 Hath not the [f]potter power

[1] Or, *answerest again, or disputest with God?*
[e] Is. 45. 9.
[f] Jer. 18. 6. Wis. 15. 7.

---

(Ex. ix. 16) is recognised by St. Paul at a later stage of his argument (*v.* 22).

Compare notes on Ex. ix. 16, and for a full discussion of this most important and much misunderstood passage, see note at the end of this chapter.

**18.** A double inference from the two passages cited in *vv.* 15–17.

*Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy.*] "**So then on whom he will hath he mercy.**" The freedom of the Divine choice is strongly marked by the emphatic position of the relative clause: compare *v.* 15.

*and whom he will he hardeneth.*] In Exodus the hardening is ascribed to God in the prediction, iv. 21 and vii. 3: in the first seven plagues it is regarded as Pharaoh's own doing, and in the last three, as God's judicial hardening: see Dean Jackson, ix. 394, 399, 400, 407, 408, 458. St. Paul here has to do with the *event* only, and not with the *process*, as his purpose is to bring forward other *events*, parallel to the rejection of the Jews. On the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, see Origen, 'De Principiis,' III. i. 10, where he shows that by one and the same operation God has mercy upon one man, and hardens another, because the heart of those who treat his kindness and forbearance with contempt is hardened by the delay of their punishment, while those who make his goodness and patience an occasion of repentance, find mercy.

The argument of the whole passage (14–18) may be summed up briefly thus:

The case of Esau and Jacob shows that man can discern no reason why God chooses one and rejects another. But it does not follow that God is unjust. Hear what He said to Moses: "*I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy.*" Is it unjust that mercy should do good where it will? Look at Pharaoh: if we could see no reason why God hardened his heart, and made him a tragical example of His severity, should we call that severity unjust? God forbid.

**19–21. God's absolute Power asserted.**

So far St. Paul has repelled the objection to God's justice, without attempting to explain the difficulty involved in it: and he knows that the same difficulty will rise up again in a different form.

**19.** *Thou wilt say then unto me.*] "*Thou wilt say* **to me then.**" Against the statement, "*whom he will he hardeneth*," this objection may be raised: "If God Himself hardens the heart, why does He yet find fault with man? What justice is there in continuing to lay the blame on a creature who goes on sinning because God so wills and he cannot resist?" The objection, though expressed in general terms, has its historical ground in the reproaches and expostulations which God continues to address to Pharaoh in Ex. ix. 17, "*As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go?*" and in x. 3, 4, "*How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before Me?*" (Jackson, 'On the Creed,' ix. 458.)

St. Paul assumes that the same objection will be made as an excuse for the unbelief of Israel. If God has chosen to harden their hearts, how can He justly lay the blame on them?

*For who hath resisted his will?*] The question expresses in a livelier form, the general truth that God's will is irresistible.

It is important to notice the word here used for "*will*" (βούλημα): but this and other cautions needed in interpreting the clause are thrown into the note at the end of the chapter, in order to leave the Apostle's argument free from interruption.

The brief and peremptory questions have a tone of discontent and presumption, which is met in *v.* 20 by a stern rebuke: explanation follows later in *v.* 22.

**20.** *Nay but, O man, who art thou . . .?*] St. Paul repels the objection, "*Why doth he yet find fault?*" by rebuking the presumption of feeble man in thus "replying against God." The marginal renderings, "answerest again," or "disputest with God" are not so good as the A. V. "*repliest* (or *makest answer*) *against* God:" compare Job xxxii. 12; Luke xiv. 6; and for the like disparaging question, see xiv. 4, and Plato, 'Gorgias,' p. 452, b. "Magnifici doctoris severitate deterret, cum dicit, O homo, tu quis es?" Origen, 'In Exodum Hom.' iv. 2.

*Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?*] This figure of the potter and his vessel is derived originally from the account of the creation of man

Digitized by Google

over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?

22 *What* if God, willing to shew *his* wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath [1] fitted to destruction:

[1] Or, *made up*.

---

in Gen. ii. 7, whence were derived the term "protoplast" applied to Adam by the LXX Wisdom vii. 1), and "plasma" as a description of man: compare Ps. ciii. 14, and 1 Tim. ii. 13.

Here St. Paul, quoting from Isaiah and Jeremiah, justifies God's rejection of the Jews in the very words of the Prophets who predicted it. See Is. xxix. 16, which is rendered by the LXX thus: "Shall ye not be counted as the potter's clay? Shall the thing formed (τό πλάσμα) say to him that formed it, Thou formedst me not? Or the thing made to him that made it, Thou madest me not wisely? Compare Is. xlv. 9: "*Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?*" See also Is. lxiv. 8.

What makes the Prophet's language so exactly appropriate to the Apostle's argument is, that they are both dealing with the same subject, namely, God's formation of Israel as a nation, and His consequent unquestionable right to deal with it as seems good to Him.

**21.** *Hath not the potter power over the clay, &c.*] "**Or** *hath not*," &c. This is the alternative to the argument of *v.* 20: *either* you must admit that Israel is incompetent to question God's dealings, *or* you must say that the potter hath not power over the clay. St. Paul refers to Jer. xviii. 4-6, where see notes, and observe the heading of the chapter: "*Under the type of a potter is shewed God's absolute power in disposing of nations.*" In *v.* 6 we read: "*O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel.*" The passage is the more remarkable because the declaration that God is as free to do what He will with Israel as the potter with the clay, is followed immediately (*vv.* 7-10) by the promise that the exercise of this absolute power shall be allowed to depend on the penitence or impenitence of the nation. St. Paul, in *vv.* 22, 23, shows how this promise had been fulfilled in God's long-suffering towards Israel.

*of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?*] Here we have a distinct allusion to the language of Wisdom xv. 7, 8, but the application is totally different. The subject there is the folly of idol worship, as shown by the power of the potter to make a vain god out of the same clay, of which "*he maketh both the vessels that serve for clean uses, and likewise also such as serve to the contrary.*"

By St. Paul this distinction between "*one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour*" is applied, like the rest of the figure of which it forms part, to God's absolute freedom in dealing with one nation and another. "The same lump of clay" represents mankind as a whole. Shall Israel say to his Maker, Thou hast no right to make of me anything else than a vessel unto honour, and Thou hast no right to make of the Gentiles anything but a vessel unto dishonour? (Godet). This reference of the passage to national, not individual, election is required by the whole purpose of St. Paul's argument, and placed beyond doubt by *vv.* 24-26. Compare Ecclesiasticus xxxiii. 10-12: "All men are from the ground, and Adam was created of earth. In much knowledge the Lord hath divided them, and made their ways diverse. Some of them hath he blessed and exalted, and some of them hath he sanctified and set near himself: but some of them hath he cursed and brought low, and turned out of their places. *As the clay is in the potter's hand, to fashion it at his pleasure: so man is in the hand of him that made him, to render to them as liketh him best.*"

**22-24. God's Justice and Mercy vindicated.**

**22.** After having asserted God's unquestionable right to do with His creatures whatever seems best to His Godly wisdom, St. Paul now passes on to justify the actual course of His dealing. This justification consists in *the fact* of God's long-suffering, with its twofold *motive* of judgment and mercy.

*What if God.*] Literally, "But if God." The sentence is unfinished, but its meaning is easily completed: "But if God in fact showed much long-suffering, what further objection can you make against His justice?" We may express it more briefly, thus: "**But** *what if God*," &c.

For similar examples of sentences beginning with εἰ δέ, and left incomplete, see Acts xxiii. 9, and Winer, 'Grammar,' § 64. **But** (δέ) marks the contrast between God's absolute right and His actual long-suffering; see note on ii. 17-24.

The whole argument is very like that of Wisdom xi., xii.: see especially xii. 2. "*Therefore chastenest thou them by little and little that offend, and warnest them by putting them in remembrance wherein they have offended,*

Digitized by Google

23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,

---

*that leaving their wickedness, they may believe on Thee, O Lord:*" and *v.* 26, "*But they that would not be reformed by that correction, wherein he dallied with them* (παιγνίοις ἐπιτιμήσεως) *shall feel a judgment worthy of God.*" The position is no longer that of God's *absolute right*, but of His actual dealing.

*Vv.* 22, 23 are St. Paul's interpretation and generalised application of the passage concerning Pharaoh quoted in *v.* 17, and the quotation and the comment help to explain each other.

(1.) The comment, "*endured with much long-suffering*," shows that St. Paul's version, "*I have raised thee up*" has the same sense as the Hebrew and LXX, namely, "I have sustained and upheld thee," correcting only the grammatical form of διετηρήθης, "thou wast preserved."

(2.) Again the words "*for this very purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power*," make it certain, that when St. Paul writes "*God willing to show*," he means "because He willed" and not "although He willed."

The desire "*to show his wrath and to make his power known*," was not a hindrance to His forbearance (as Meyer regards it), but a motive to it; a motive too acting throughout the long series of warnings and judgments, and not limited to the final catastrophe. See Ex. vii. 5, 17; viii. 10, 22; ix. 14, 29. St. Paul's interpretation thus agrees exactly with the true and full sense of the original "**for to show thee my power;**" and it is equally applicable to either case, the destruction of Pharaoh, or the rejection of Israel, in both of which God's "*much long-suffering*" resulted, through their own obstinacy, in making the "*vessels of wrath*" more conspicuous objects of His avenging power.

See the note at the end of the chapter on *v.* 17.

*his power.*] τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ, corresponding to "*my power*" (τὴν δύναμίν μου) *v.* 17: compare note on viii. 3, "*What the law could not do.*"

*the vessels of wrath.*] "**vessels of wrath,**" without the Definite Article. Though his language is still full of allusions to the previous passage (*vv.* 17–21), St. Paul has now passed from the particular example of the hardening of Pharaoh to the general principle which connects it with his immediate subject, the rejection of Israel.

The word "*vessel*," taken from the figure of the potter (*v.* 21), implies some kind of use which the vessel is to serve: thus "*vessels of wrath*," and "*vessels of mercy*" are such as fitly serve God's purpose of showing His wrath and His mercy. Compare Jer. l. 25; Ps. ii. 9.

"*fitted for destruction*," *i. e.* fully prepared and worthy: compare Wisdom xii. 20, ὀφειλομένους θανάτῳ, "*condemned to death.*" The Passive Participle does not define how, or by whom, the vessels of wrath have been thus prepared. "Pharaoh was fitted by himself and his own doing" (Chrysostom): "fitted by the potter" (Van Hengel): "He who has fitted them for destruction is God" (Meyer): all these views are too narrow and exclusive. We have passed from the view of God's absolute power (19–21) to that of His actual dealing with His creatures, and God does not in fact fit man, nor the potter his vessel, for destruction. Both factors, God's probationary judgments, and man's perverse will, conduce to the result, and it is the result only that is here expressed by the Participle.

The description "*vessels of wrath fitted for destruction*" was eminently applicable to the mass of the Jewish nation in St. Paul's day: "*they please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost*" (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16).

**23.** *And that he might make known the riches of his glory.*] This is a direct and primary purpose (ἵνα) of God's long-suffering towards "*vessels of wrath.*"

"*The glory*" of God is, in general, the manifestation of the Divine perfections (see on v. 2), and, in this context, more especially the manifestation of His goodness and mercy (Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19): and "*the riches of his glory*" (Eph. i. 18; iii. 16; Col. i. 27) is that inexhaustible wealth of goodness which embraces all "*vessels of mercy*" in the fulness of blessing.

"*Salvation is of the Jews*" (John iv. 22), and therefore the chosen race, notwithstanding all its transgressions, is preserved, in order that the promised salvation may embrace in its accomplishment both the remnant of Israel and the fulness of the Gentiles.

Compare Wisdom xii. 19–22: "Thou mayest use power when thou wilt. But by such works hast thou taught thy people that the just man should be merciful, and hast made thy children to be of a good hope that thou givest repentance for sins. For if thou didst punish the enemies of thy children, and the condemned to death, *with such deliberation*, giving them time and place, whereby they might be delivered from their malice; with how great circumspection didst thou judge

Digitized by Google

24 Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?

25 As he saith also in Osee, I [g] will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved,

[g] Hos. 2. 23. 1 Pet. 2. 10.

26 [h] And it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people;

[h] Hos. 1. 10.

---

thine own sons, unto whose fathers thou hast sworn and made covenants of good promises?"

*which he had afore prepared unto glory.*] Comparing this with the parallel clause, we see—

(1.) That St. Paul is here speaking not of election or predestination, but of an actual preparation and purgation undergone by vessels of mercy to fit them for glory, before God "*makes known the riches of his glory upon them.*" Compare 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21, a passage which evidently looks back on this.

(2.) We observe that this preparation, unlike that by which "*vessels of wrath*" are "*fitted for destruction,*" is ascribed directly and exclusively to God as its author, being wholly brought about by His Providence and prevenient grace. The idea of *fitness*, akin to that of desert, is ascribed only to the vessels of wrath: see note on *v.* 22.

The vessels of mercy God has made *ready* for glory, but there is no idea of merit involved.

**24.** *Even us, whom he hath called, &c.*] Read "**whom he did also call in us,** *not only* **from among Jews,** *but also* **from among Gentiles.**" For the apposition οὓς—ἡμᾶς compare Eur. 'Iph. Taur.' 63; Bernhardy, Synt. p. 302.

We here see that the preparation mentioned in *v.* 23 preceded the actual call.

It is thus identified with the whole course of discipline and grace by which God prepared among both Jews and Gentiles a people to be called into His kingdom. Compare Luke i. 17; and Rom. ii. 14, 15.

Thus in the actual call God began to fulfil His purpose of "*making known the riches of his glory on vessels of mercy:*" and this He did the more conspicuously by calling Heathen as well as Jews.

25–29. THE CALLING OF THE GENTILES AND THE REJECTION OF THE JEWS FORETOLD IN PROPHECY.

**25.** *I will call them my people, which were not my people, and her beloved which was not beloved.*] "*I will call* **that** *my people which* **was** *not my people,*" *&c.* Hos. ii. 23, quoted freely from the LXX, the order of the two sentences being inverted.

The inference which St. Paul means to draw from the quotation is variously understood.

(1.) The promised restoration of apostate Israel may be regarded as a proof that the calling both of Jews and Gentiles (*v.* 24) is a free gift of God's grace to those who had no title to it in their previous condition (Hofmann: see note on Hos. i. 10).

(2) Chrysostom constructs an argument *à fortiori.* If Israel, after all its ingratitude, abuse of privileges, and apostasy, was yet to be restored, much more the Heathen, who never had such privileges to abuse.

But (3) the Hebrew means literally: "I will have mercy on Lo-ruhamah, and to Lo-ammi I will say, Ammi art thou."

Now these names both designate the Ten Tribes only, exclusive of Judah (Hos. i. 7), and mean that Israel has become like the Heathen, who are not God's people.

The promise of Israel's restoration therefore includes, either by parity of reason or as a typical prophecy, the calling of the Gentiles, to which St. Paul here applies it. See the treatise among Leo's works, "*On the calling of all nations,*" Lib. II. c. xviii.

This interpretation is confirmed by the inversion of the two parallel clauses, by which St. Paul brings "Lo-ammi" into immediate connection with "*the Gentiles.*" "So God's mercies again overflow His threatenings. . . . . In reversing His sentence [on Israel] He embraces in the arms of His mercy *all* who were not His people" (Pusey on Hos. ii. 23).

**26.** The whole verse is quoted exactly from the LXX of Hos. i. 10 and is joined by St. Paul to the former passage "as forming one connected declaration" (Meyer).

"*The place where it was said to them, Ye are not my people,*" is not Palestine, where the prediction was first uttered, but "the land of exile, where the name became an actual truth" (Keil and Hengstenb.).

"The place of their rejection, the Dispersion, was to be the place of their restoration" (Pusey).

This is certain from Hos. i. 11, where the restoration to God's favour precedes the return from the land of exile. St. Paul, therefore, is in full agreement with the Prophet as to the *place* intended. It is true for the Dispersion of Israel (1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 10), the typical Lo-ammi, and for all who in times past were not the people of God, that wherever they are brought to faith in Christ, "*there shall they be called* **sons** *of the living God.*" See on Hos. i. 10.

Digitized by Google

there shall they be called the children of the living God.

27 Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, [i] Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved:

28 For he will finish [1] the work, and cut *it* short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.

29 And as Esaias said before, [k] Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrha.

[i] Is. 10. 22, 23.

[1] Or, *the account.*

[k] Is. 1. 9

---

**27.** St. Paul now passes over (δὲ) from prophecies applicable to the calling of the Gentiles to others concerning the exclusion of all but a remnant of the Jews: the context of Hos. i. 10 naturally suggesting the repetition of the same prediction by Isaiah.

*Esaias also crieth concerning Israel.*] "**But Esaias crieth for Israel**" (Wiclif). The prophet's cry is addressed to God (Is. x. 22) as an earnest pleading of His promise: it is therefore a cry of intercession, "as if it were the Spirit of adoption 'crying out' in him" (viii. 15: see Note on Is. x. 22). Godet's idea, that Isaiah's *cry* (κράζει) is the menacing tone of the herald proclaiming God's judgment *upon* Israel, is entirely opposed to the meaning of the words and to the tenor of the context.

*Though the number of the children of Israel, &c.*] St. Paul here varies from the LXX of Is. x. 22, and goes back to the words of Hosea i. 10. The prophecy is of course founded on the Promise in Gen. xxii. 17, which it defines more closely.

*a remnant shall be saved.*] Read, "**The** *remnant,*" *&c.* This is the point of Isaiah's prophecy, "Shear-jashub," and is emphatically repeated in *vv.* 21, 22. It means that "*the remnant*" shall return not merely from the Captivity, but "*unto the mighty God,*" *i.e.* Messiah: compare Is. ix. 6 and x. 21, and notes there. It is therefore a distinct prediction that "*the remnant shall be saved*" in Christ.

**28.** *For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness.*] "**For a word he finisheth, and cutteth short in righteousness.**" On the exact meaning of the Hebrew, see Notes on Isaiah.

St. Paul retains the words of the LXX, which give a meaning far from exact, yet not opposed to the original, and in itself true and sufficient for the present purpose.

It is a general characteristic of God, that any work of His he accomplishes and cuts short with summary justice. (Compare Isa. xxviii. 22, and the LXX there.)

*because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.*] "**For a short-cut word will,**" &c.

St. Paul still follows the LXX, but omits the less important details: this part of the quotation refers to God's summary sentence upon Israel, in which the mass is rejected and only the remnant saved.

The abbreviated reading of the earliest MSS., adopted by Tischendorf (8) and Tregelles, may be thus rendered: "For finishing and cutting short word will the Lord perform it upon earth."

**29.** *And as Esaias said before, Except, &c.*] Read, **And, as Esaias hath said before, &c.** The Perfect denotes, as usual, what stands written in Scripture.

The Greek word (προείρηκεν) may mean *either* "hath foretold" (compare Acts i. 14, 1 Thess. iii. 6), *or* simply "hath said before" (1 Thess. iv. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 3, xiii. 2; Gal. i. 9).

In favour of the latter meaning it is argued that Isaiah's words (i. 9) refer to the state of the people in his own time, and there is nothing in the context to indicate even a secondary prophetic sense.

We must suppose therefore, according to this view, that St. Paul simply makes Isaiah's words his own, using them, not as a prediction fulfilled, but as a description applicable to the state of Israel in his own day: "And, as Isaiah hath said before, so say I again in his words, *except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, &c.* The word "*before*" is also taken to mean "in an earlier passage." (Alford).

The other meaning "hath foretold" is preferred by most commentators on Romans, the passage of Isaiah (i. 7–9) being regarded as a preface in which "the Prophet with a few ground strokes gathers up the whole future of the people of Israel" (Drechsler).

A decision, which must depend on the exact meaning of the original passage, belongs to a commentary on Isaiah, or a treatise on the nature of Prophecy, rather than to this note. The quotation is well suited to St. Paul's argument, whether he uses it as a prophecy fulfilled, or merely as a description applicable to his own time.

*a seed.*] The Hebrew word rendered in Is. i. 9 "*remnant*" is not שְׁאָר as in the prophecy of "Shear-jashub," but שָׂרִיד as in Num. xxi. 35, xxiv. 19, Job xx. 21, &c., which denotes the few who escape and survive. This remnant the LXX regard as

Digitized by Google

30 What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith.

31 But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.

32 Wherefore? Because *they sought* it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone;

33 As it is written, [l]Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be [1]ashamed.

[l] Is. 8. 14 & 28. 16. 1 Pet. 2. 6

[1] Or, *confounded.*

---

"seed" (σπέρμα), from which the nation shall spring up again: compare Hos. ii. 23, Is. vi. 13.

*we had been as Sodoma.*] "*We had* **become** *as Sodom*," where no seed was left (Bengel). "Here again he points out another circumstance, that not even the small remnant escaped of themselves, but would all have perished, had not God in great mercy saved them by faith" (Chrysost.).

**30.** *What shall we say then?*] What conclusion shall we draw from this view of God's dealings? The answer consists of two parts: (1) a statement of facts (30, 31) drawn from the whole preceding discussion in *vv.* 6–29, and expressed as a striking paradox: and (2) a declaration of the cause (*vv.* 32, 33), by which the paradox in the case of the Jews is explained.

*That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith.*] Read, "**That Gentiles, which were not following after righteousness, attained to righteousness, but the righteousness that is of faith.**" The two strange things are that "**Gentiles**" attained righteousness, and that they attained it without seeking it (Chrys.). Compare ii. 14: "*Gentiles, that have not a law*," to quicken the moral sense, are not, like Jews, consciously seeking to obtain righteousness: yet they "*attained to righteousness*, **but** *the righteousness that is of faith*." The "**but**" (δέ iii. 22) introduces a special definition, an explanatory modification, by which the paradox is at once solved, so far as the Gentiles are concerned. See Winer, III. § liii. 7, b.

If here St. Paul "with the fewest words touches the deepest foundation of the matter" (Ewald), it is because he has already (iii., iv.) fully discussed the nature of that righteousness of faith in which the whole solution lies. Observe the thrice-repeated "*righteousness*," as in *v.* 31 the repetition of "*law of righteousness*." The whole passage is framed for pointed effect. "The hearer is strongly affected by the repetition of the same word, as if a weapon were to pierce the same part of the body again and again." Auctor ad Herenn. iv. 28. (Meyer.)

**31.** *But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.*] "*But Israel*, **following after a law of righteousness, did not attain unto a law** [*of righteousness*]."

What the Gentiles seek not, yet attain, is "*righteousness*," but what Israel seeks and yet fails to attain is not simply "*righteousness*," but "*a law of righteousness*," i.e., a law producing righteousness, such a rule of moral and religious life as could make them righteous before God. Such "*a law of righteousness*" they strove to find, and some did find, in God's law revealed by Moses (Luke i. 6): but the mass of the people "**did not attain unto a law** [*of righteousness*]." On the reading see the Additional Note.

**32.** *Wherefore?*] The question refers only to the case of Israel (*v.* 31): why did they not attain to a law of righteousness? With the received Text a Finite Verb (ἐδίωξαν), must be supplied in the answer: "*Because they sought it not* **from** *faith, but* **as from works of law.** *For they stumbled*," &c. The fact that they stumbled is thus regarded as a proof (from effect to cause) that they did not start from faith in God, but from a reliance on the merit of their own works. Had they started from faith, they would have found a law of righteousness, as the Apostle shows in the next chapter (x. 3–13).

But omitting γάρ (with modern editors and Tisch. 8), we must supply a Participle διώκοντες, and render thus: "**Because seeking it not from faith, but as from works, they stumbled,**" **&c.** The argument is thus direct and simple.

In "**as of works,**" "**as**" indicates *the idea* which characterised their pursuit of a law of righteousness: they *thought* to attain to it from works. On this use of ὡς see Winer, III. § lxv. 9, and compare 2 Cor. ii. 17.

*they stumbled at that stumblingstone.*] "*They stumbled* **against the stone of stumbling.**" The Articles indicate the well-known "stone of stumbling" of Isaiah viii. 14, where see notes.

**33.** *As it is written.*] Is. xxviii. 16. This is a remarkable example of the freedom with which St. Paul quotes the language of the O T.



Digitized by Google

Both passages as well as Ps. cxviii., were referred by the Jews to Messiah: see reff. in Rosenmüller on Is. viii. 14, and Schoettgen, 'Horæ Heb.', and compare Matt. xxi. 42, Luke ii. 34, 1 Pet. ii. 6–8. St. Paul by taking the words "stone of stumbling and rock of offence" (Is. viii. 14), and substituting them in Is. xxviii. 16, instead of "for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation," has combined both the threat and the promise in one quotation. The best comment is 1 Pet. ii. 6–8, where the different passages are all quoted separately: see the notes there.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 5, 6, 8, 15, 17, 19, 31.

5. A. The reference of the words ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς κ. τ. λ. to Christ is supported by the following considerations:—

(a) It is the natural and simple construction, which every Greek scholar would adopt without hesitation, if no question of doctrine were involved. This cannot be said for any other construction.

(b) It is suggested by the immediate context: thus Meyer, who rejects "the ancient ecclesiastical exposition," candidly confesses that "the contrast obviously implied in τὸ κατὰ σάρκα would permit us mentally to supply a τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα as suggesting itself after ὁ ὤν. That self-evident negative antithesis—*not as concerning the Spirit*—would thus have in ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς κ. τ. λ. its positive elucidation. Compare i. 3, and the note there on κατὰ σάρκα, κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης.

The true inference from the context is well expressed by Theodoret in Cramer's Catena: "And then last he puts the greatest of their blessings—"*and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh.*" And though the addition, "*as concerning the flesh,*" was sufficient to imply (παραδηλῶσαι) the deity of Christ, yet he adds, "*who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen,*" both showing the difference of the natures, and explaining the reasonableness of his lamentation, that though He who is God over all was of them according to the flesh, yet they fell away from this kinship."

The assertion of Christ's Divine Majesty is thus admirably suited to the purpose of the passage, which is to extol the greatness of the privileges bestowed upon Israel, and so unhappily forfeited.

(c) The reference to Christ is supported by the unanimous consent of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. See Irenæus, L. III. c. xvi. § 3; Tertullian, 'adv. Praxean,' c. xiii. c. xv.; Hippolytus, 'adv. Noetum,' vi.; Origen, in h. l.; Cyprian, 'Testimon.' II. 6; Novatian, 'de Trin.' c. xiii.; Methodius, 'Symeon et Anna,' § 1. In the Arian controversies our passage is constantly used by Athanasius: *e.g.* Or. I. c. Arianos, c. 10, 11, 24. The same interpretation is given by Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria (c. Julian. x.), Œcumenius, Theophylact.

Against this remarkable consent of Christian antiquity there is nothing to be set of any weight. Cyril puts into the mouth of the Emperor Julian a denial of the reference to Christ, only in order to affirm the true interpretation. Tischendorf brings forward two passages of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and two of the Pseudo-Ignatius; but they do not refer to this passage, nor deny that Christ is "God over all" (ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός), but are directed against the Sabellian heresy which made Him identical with the Father, "*the* God over all" (ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός).

Even Socinus admits that the words are applied to Christ.

The chief objections urged against the ancient interpretation by modern theologians (Fritzsche, Baur, Ewald, Meyer, &c.) are as follows:

(1) That St. Paul never applies Θεός as a predicate to Christ.

(2) That to call Christ not simply Θεός, but, as here, ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, is absolutely incompatible with the entire view of the N. T. as to the dependence of the Son on the Father.

(3) That in the genuine Apostolical writings we never meet with a doxology to Christ in the form which is usual with doxologies to God.

As to (1) see Notes on Tit. ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 12; cf. 2 Pet. i. 1, iii. 18; Usteri, 'Paulin. Lehrbegriff.' p. 309, and Cremer, Lex. Θεός. Even if the fact were as asserted, it would not be conclusive against the application of Θεός to Christ in this passage. For what would be thought of an assertion that St. John could not have applied Θεός to Christ in Joh. i. 1, because (as is alleged by Meyer and others) he does not elsewhere so apply it? Compare the Additional Note on iii. 25, Obj$^n$. (5), for other examples of usages occurring once only in N. T.

(2) Bp. Lightfoot, in his profound discussion of the Christology of St. Paul ('Ep. to the Colossians,' p. 190), has shown that though St. Paul does not use the term Λόγος, his doctrine of the Person of Christ is in substance identical with that of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is not adequately represented by "any conception short

Digitized by Google

of the perfect deity and perfect humanity of Christ."

We may add that "the dependence of the Son on the Father," as expressed in the N. T., (1 Cor. viii. 6, xv. 28) might be perfectly reconciled with the statement that He is "God over all," though not with the Sabellian view that He is "*the* God over all," *i.e.* the same Person as the Father.

But in fact the title "God over all" (earlier English versions) does not occur in this passage, nor apparently anywhere in the LXX or N. T. It is rightly corrected in the A.V. "*Who is over all, God blessed for ever.*" This follows the exact order of the Greek, agrees with St. Paul's usage in Eph iv. 6, and is the only construction which preserves the twofold antithesis between Christ's Jewish origin and universal supremacy, and between His Human and Divine natures.

(3) In urging this third objection, Meyer does not deny that the doxologies in 2 Pet. iii. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 2 Tim. iv. 18, refer to Christ, but regards this reference as "just one of the traces of post-apostolic composition." Nevertheless his objection is wide of the mark, for ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός εὐλογητὸς κ. τ. λ. as applied to Christ is ***not a doxology at all***: but a solemn declaration of Deity, exactly similar in form to 2 Cor. xi. 31; compare Rom. i. 25: it is remarkable that these two are the only passages, besides the present, in which the combination εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is used by St. Paul, and in neither is it a Doxology, but an assertion respecting the subject of the sentence. (Alford.) The further objection, that εὐλογητός is never elsewhere applied to Christ, but only εὐλογημένος (Mat. xxi. 9; xxiii. 39, &c.), and that εὐλογητός, is only applied to God, and εὐλογημένος to man, is wholly fallacious. The LXX apply εὐλογητός to man in Deut. vii. 14; Ruth ii. 20; 1 Sam. xv. 13, and εὐλογημένος to God in 1 Chr xvi. 36; 2 Chr. ix. 8; Ps. lxxii 20; Ez. iii. 12, and in all these passages the Hebrew word is precisely the same.

B.

Most of those who reject the ancient interpretation put a full-stop after σάρκα (with two or three inferior MSS), and take the whole clause as a doxology to the Father: "The God who is over all be blessed for ever."

(1) To this construction it is a fatal objection, that both in the LXX and in N. T., wherever εὐλογητός occurs in a doxology, it stands first, and that necessarily, on account of the emphasis: Ps. lxviii. 19, is no exception, nor are the other passages quoted by Fritzsche, 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chr. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Ps. cxiii. 2, in all of which the Verb (εἴη, ἔστω, γένοιτο) stands first in the sentence, and **εὐλογημένος, is used, not εὐλογητός.**

(2) The participle ὢν is in this construction superfluous and awkward. Moreover ὁ ὢν must naturally be taken as an apposition to the preceding subject (ὁ Χριστός), there being nothing to indicate a départure from this most usual construction, of which see examples in 2 Cor. xi. 31; Joh. i. 18, and xii. 17.

(3) The enumeration of Israel's privileges, instead of rising to a climax, would come down at the close into a mere limitation and restriction—"*as concerning the flesh.*"

(4) It has been shown in the foot-note that a doxology to the Father is not in harmony with the context.

In fact, the clause, taken as a doxology, is both in form and sense so tasteless and inappropriate, that we may confidently say, it was not so meant by St. Paul.

C.

Erasmus, who is followed by Reuss, proposed to place the stop (as in Cod. 71) after πάντων, so that the preceding words refer to Christ, and then the doxology to God follows. But how intolerably abrupt is this! (Meyer.)

D.

The conjectural transposition of ὢν ὁ for ὁ ὢν is perfectly arbitrary, and has nothing to recommend it. "Was St. Paul likely to affirm that the Jews had an exclusive interest in the One True God, when he had already in this very Epistle (iii. 29) asserted the contrary? (Middleton.)

---

When we review the history of the interpretation, it cannot but be regarded as a remarkable fact that every objection urged against the ancient interpretation rests ultimately on dogmatic presuppositions, and that every alternative that has been proposed is more or less objectionable both in the form of expression and in the connection of thought.

We fully accept Dean Alford's conclusion, if only we may apply it to the A. V. instead of his rendering "God over all:" "The rendering given above is then not only that most agreeable to the usage of the Apostle, but ***the only one admissible by the rules of grammar and arrangement.*** It also admirably suits the context: for having enumerated the historic advantages of the Jewish people, he concludes by stating one which ranks far higher than all—that from them sprung, according to the flesh, He *who is over all, God blessed for ever.*"

6. In this passage (οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ) the sense is too clear to be mistaken even in the A. V. ("*For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel*"), but is much better expressed by the "Five Clergymen," "**For not all they which are of Israel, are Israel.**" Here the emphasis



Digitized by Google

supplies in a measure the force of οὗτοι, which means "these as such" (vi hujus termini): it might be rendered here "are therefore Israel." (Peile.)

The demonstrative pronoun thus emphatically added repeats and enforces the preceding Subject, limits it emphatically to its previous definition, and makes it stand out in this limitation distinct and separate from all other notions. Compare Gal. iii. 7, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ. The effect is to affirm or deny the identity of the subject *as thus defined* with the predicate: see Bernhardy, 'Gk. Syntax,' 283; Winer, Part III. § 23, 24; Plato, 'Charmides,' p. 163, C.

**8.** In οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα Θεοῦ, etc., this force of the pronoun has not been rightly expressed in the A. V.: "*They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.*" According to this rendering all the children of the flesh seem to be excluded, and the passage has in fact been frequently thus misunderstood; *e.g.* "As Ishmael, who was born after the flesh (Gal. iv. 23), *i.e.* according to the course of nature, was rejected, so also are the children of the flesh" (Hodge). To justify this interpretation, τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός must be taken in a pregnant sense, "the children of the flesh who are nothing more than children of the flesh." In Gal. iv. 22, 23, 29, this sense is made clear by the distinction made from the first between the one son "born after the flesh" and the other "by promise." Here the Apostle expresses the same truth in a different way, by drawing a distinction between "all that are of Israel," and "Israel" in the true sense of the name,—between the seed of Abraham as a whole, and the promised seed. This form of expression is best suited to the Apostle's purpose of showing how God maintained the principle of election in every stage of the patriarchal and national history.

The right explanation is given by the Greek Fathers generally, and is well expressed by Œcumenius: οὐ γὰρ ἐπειδή τινες τέκνα σαρκικὰ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, ἤδη καὶ τέκνα εἰσὶ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν.

**15.** The A. V. by repeating the same tense, "*I will have mercy*," represents correctly the *sense* both of the Hebrew and of the Greek, in which the tenses, though differing in form, are strictly co-ordinate in sense. Meyer's remark "that the Future denotes the actual compassion fulfilling itself in point of fact, which God promises to show to the persons concerned, towards whom He stands in the mental relation (ἐλεῶ, Present) of pity," is grammatically incorrect (Donaldson, 'Greek Gr.' §§ 505, 514; Madvig, §§ 121, 125; Winer, part iii. sect. xli. p. 306, &c. &c.).

Some think that the emphasis lies on the repeated verb: "My mercy shall be (pure) mercy" (Alford), or, "My mercy shall be sure and great" (Dean Jackson, ix. 440).

But the real emphasis is on the Relative ('whomsoever'), as is apparent in the Greek, where the force of ἂν is thrown on it (Jelf, 'Gr. Gr.' § 428; Madvig, § 126). Thus the sense is, "the objects of God's mercy are chosen by that mercy itself, and not by anything external to it." This sense is explained in *v.* 16, and expressly asserted in *v.* 18, "*Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will.*"

**17.** It is important to compare the versions of the passage quoted, Ex. ix. 16, with the original.

Heb. (literally rendered). "But indeed because of this I made thee stand, because of making thee see my power, and to the intent that my name may be declared in all the earth."

LXX: καὶ ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.

St. Paul: εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, κ.τ.λ.

A. V. (Rom. ix. 17) "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth."

(*a.*) The A. V. Ex. ix. 16, "*And in very deed for this cause*," and St. Paul's εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο are more emphatic and precise, and in this agree better with the Heb., than does ἕνεκεν τούτου (LXX).

(*b.*) The margin, "*I have made thee stand*," correctly represents הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ, Hiphil of עמד, which Fürst renders, "statuere, stabilire; præficere, constituere; conservare, confirmare."

Gesenius wrongly ascribes to it the meaning "rouse, stir up," in Neh. vi. 7 (A. V. "*appoint*"), and in Dan. xi. 11, 13, where it means "set in array," "constituere aciem."

The meaning "establish, uphold, preserve" is found in 1 Ki. xv. 4, 2 Chr. ix. 8, Prov. xxix. 4, and Dan. xi. 14.

It thus appears that διετηρήθης "thou wast preserved" (LXX) is right in sense, but wrong in substituting the Passive for the Active Voice: as the Active expresses God's agency more directly and emphatically, and so is better suited to St. Paul's purpose of declaring His absolute power, he restores it in ἐξήγειρά σε, "I have raised thee up" as from danger or death. The Compound Verb in the only passage where it is found in the N. T., 1 Cor. vi. 14, and in Job v. 11, ἀπολωλότας ἐξεγείροντα εἰς σωτηρίαν has this signification.

This sense, "I have raised up," or "preserved thee," is supported by the LXX διετηρήθης, by a various reading in the Hexapla διετήρησά σε, by Orig. Philocalia c. xxiii. διετηρήθη Φαραὼ ὑπὲρ ἐνδείξεως δυνάμεως Θεοῦ

Digitized by Google

by Chrys. in l. *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐτηρεῖτο*, by Onkelos, and the Arabic in Walton's Polyglott (see below), and is admitted by Meyer to be the correct historical interpretation of Ex. ix. 16. Many other meanings have been invented:

(1.) I have brought thee into existence (Beza).

(2.) I have brought thee forward and laid this part upon thee (Calvin).

(3.) I have raised thee to the throne (Glöckler).

(4.) I have stirred thee up to resistance (Augustine).

"But" (to use Meyer's words) "these special definitions of the sense make the Apostle say something so *entirely different*, both from the original and from the LXX, that they ought to be necessitated by the context; but this is not the case."

The same criticism condemns Meyer's own artificial interpretation that *Paul expands* the special sense of the Hebrew word (*i. e.* "preserved"), to denote the whole appearance of Pharaoh: "I have caused thee to emerge," thy whole historical appearance has been brought about by me, in order that, &c.

(*c.*) Instead of "show my power in thee," the Hebrew means "show to thee," lit. "make thee to see my power." The A. V. recognises this true rendering in Ex. ix. 16, by printing "*in*" in Italics: so all the ancient versions, as represented in Walton's Polyglott;

*Onkelos:* "*Sustinui* te, ut ostenderem *tibi*," &c.

*Samar:* "*Subsistere* te feci, ut ostenderem *tibi*."

*Arab.* "Te *reservavi*, ut ostenderem *tibi*."

*Syr.* "Ob id te *constitui*, ut ostenderem *tibi*."

From these remarks, and the notes in this commentary on Ex. ix. 15 and 16, it will be seen that the sense of the whole passage is as follows: "I will spare thee no longer, but smite thee to the heart with all my plagues, that thou mayest know that there is no power like mine (*v.* 14): for if I had not withheld my hand, but had stretched it out to smite thee and thy people with the pestilence, thou wouldst have been cut off from the earth at once. But indeed I spared and upheld thee, for this very purpose (already declared in *v.* 14) to show thee my power."

As Pharaoh is solemnly warned in *v.* 14 that he will be smitten to the heart, in being taught that there is none like God, it is clear that the words "show thee my power" in *v.* 16, also include the contingency of Pharaoh's continued resistance and destruction, and are used in the same rhetorical sense as we find in Ex. xiv. 4, 18. "And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord." Compare Judges viii. 16, 1 Sam. xiv. 12: "we will show you a thing," "we will make you to know." A still more striking example of this mode of expression is found in Ps. lix. 13: "*Consume them in wrath, consume them, that they may not be; and let them know that God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth.*" The persons indicated are the same throughout, and the Psalmist's meaning is, Let them perish, and in perishing learn God's power. See Delitzsch on the Psalm.

We thus see that the rendering of the LXX, though grammatically wrong, is not bad in sense: for as Pharaoh did in fact perish in being taught the greatness of God's power, it seemed to the LXX more natural to regard the lesson as *taught to others in his person*: and this interpretation being equally suitable to St. Paul's argument, is adopted by him, but not without a very significant change.

(*d.*) For *ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοί* (LXX) St. Paul writes *ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ . . . καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου, κ. τ. λ.* The reason is evident. According to the Hebrew God's first and direct purpose in upholding Pharaoh was "to show him His power;" the secondary purpose, contingent on the fulfilment of the former, was "that God's name might be declared in all the earth." The LXX version, "show in thee my power," reduces the primary purpose to a mere equivalent of the secondary, and therefore St. Paul rejects *ἵνα* and uses *ὅπως* in both clauses: "for this very purpose I upheld thee, that so," &c. This repetition of *ὅπως* is found nowhere else in N. T.

*Hofm.* "St. Paul renders בַּעֲבוּר as well as לְמַעַן by *ὅπως*, to express what God wished *in this way* to attain."

*Van Hengel*, admitting fully that *ὅπως* and *ἵνα* are often used indifferently, in other writers as well as in the LXX and N. T., yet maintains (and proves) that in many passages both of the Classical and Biblical writers there is an unquestionable distinction. Besides Plat. Rep. viii. 566 E, 567 A, and Xen. Mem. IV. iv. 16, cited by Van H., see also Mem. II. i. 19, Anab. II. vi. 21, and Kühner's note.

In St. Paul's epistles we may notice 1 Cor. i. 27, where the design embraces two actions one immediate (*ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ*), the other contingent on it (*ὅπως μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σάρξ*, "that so no flesh," &c.).

2 Cor. viii. 13, 14: *ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα, ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης.* 2 Thess. i. 12 (similar).

**19.** St. Paul seems to have in mind such passages as Wisdom xii. 12: *τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ, τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου;* Job ix. 19: *τίς οὖν κριματι ἀυτοῦ ἀντιστησεται;*

Two cautions are needed.

1. St. Paul speaks here, not of the primary and spontaneous will of God, not of that

Digitized by Google

which God, of Himself alone, desires (θέλημα); but of the counsel or decree which He so forms as to include and overrule the free action of man (βούλημα). See Eph. i. 5, 11: Donaldson's 'New Cratylus,' § 463; Plato, 'Leges' vi. 769 D, vii. 802, C.

When ἐθέλω and βούλομαι are distinguished, the former means the simple spontaneous will, the latter the conscious and deliberate purpose. See Ammonius, ed. Valckn. pp. 31, 70, whose remark has been too hastily rejected.

2. It is again the *event*, and not the intermediate *process*, that is in question. Man does resist the will of God (θέλημα), that primary will, which leads him to repentance, but the event always corresponds with the Divine purpose (βούλημα).

31. The second δικαιοσύνης has considerable authority, especially of Versions and Fathers, but is not found in the earliest Uncials, and is rejected by nearly all critical editors. Many good interpreters, however, still consider it indispensable in the text; Meyer calls it "the tragic point of the negative counter-statement."

The point of the paradox certainly is that the Jews failed to attain the very thing which they were following after, i. e., "a law of righteousness." If therefore δικαιοσύνης be not repeated, still νόμου must have the same meaning as in the first clause, "a law" such as they were seeking, and therefore, in fact, "a law of righteousness."

## CHAPTER X.

5 *The scripture sheweth the difference betwixt the righteousness of the law, and this of faith,* 11 *and that all, both Jew and Gentile, that believe, shall not be confounded,* 18 *and that the Gentiles shall receive the word and believe.* 19 *Israel was not ignorant of these things.*

BRETHREN, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.

2 For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

3 For they being ignorant of

### CHAP. X.—THE CAUSE OF ISRAEL'S STUMBLING.

The subject of this chapter is the fact asserted in ix. 31–33, that Israel failed to attain a law of righteousness because they sought a righteousness dependent on the merit of their own works. But before entering on the painful and invidious task of condemning his own nation, St. Paul renews the assurance of his heartfelt interest in their salvation.

1. *Brethren,*] This expression of affection towards his readers is the more appropriate here because there were many Jewish Christians among them.

*my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.*] "*My heart's desire and* **my supplication to God on their behalf is for salvation.**" The word (εὐδοκία) here rendered "*desire,*" and in Phil. i. 15 "*good will,*" ii. 13 "*good pleasure,*" means not mere passive benevolence, but an active delight and pleasure, which "when directed to an object not actually existent, but still to be realised, has of course the character of a wish" (Philippi). Compare 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 8, and Bp. Lightfoot's notes on Philippians.

For the distinction between "prayer" (προσευχή) in general, but addressed to God only, and δέησις, a petition for some particular benefit addressed to God or man, see Phil. iv. 6, Eph. vi. 18, 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 5, in all of which passages the A. V. has "**supplication.**"

"*For Israel*" is a reading probably due to the commencement of a new chapter in Church Lectionaries: the true reading (αὐτῶν) shows the close connection with ch. ix.

In ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία the limiting particle shows that there is already in the Apostle's mind a thought opposed to that which he would desire: this thought is found in *v.* 3.

Van Hengel imagines a different antithesis, "the goodwill of *my* heart on their behalf, whatever their own perverse will may be." But the slightly emphatic ἐμῆς is due to the distinction between the desire of St. Paul's *own heart* and his supplication *to God.*

2. *For I bear them record*] The reason of the Apostle's desire and prayer for Israel: he knew their zeal and their want of knowledge, for he had shared largely in both (Acts xxii. 3).

"*Zeal for God,*" being in itself good, is an encouragement to prayer on their behalf. St. Paul's affection is thus again seen in pointing first to that which is praiseworthy: see on i. 8.

*but not according to knowledge.*] Ἐπίγνωσις is full and thorough knowledge, not that imperfect knowledge (γνῶσις) which "*puffeth up*" (1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 12: compare Rom. i. 28; Eph. i. 17). That the zeal of the Jews

Digitized by Google

God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.

4 For Christ *is* the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

5 For Moses describeth the right-

---

was without the guidance of this true knowledge, is shown in the next verse.

3. *For they being ignorant of God's righteousness,*] **"For being ignorant," &c.**: "*they*," being wholly without emphasis, should have a less prominent place in the sentence.

They were ignorant that the only source of righteousness is God, "*who justifieth the ungodly*" (iii. 21–26; iv. 5): and thus "*zeal for God*" only made them seek to set up and "*establish* (iii. 31) *their own righteousness*," *i. e.* the righteousness which they thought they could make valid before God by strict observance of His law (Phil. iii. 9).

*have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.*] "*The righteousness of God*" is here presented as His divine *ordinance* for man's salvation, and in its very essence, as God's righteousness, it involves man's self-renunciation and submission.

For the Middle sense of ὑπετάγησαν compare viii. 7, xiii. 1; Heb. xii. 9; James iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 13. Read "*For being ignorant of God's righteousness, and* **seeking** *to establish their own righteousness,* **they submitted not** *unto the righteousness of God.*"

4. *For Christ is the end of the law*] Confirmation of *v.* 3. The Jews sought to establish their own righteousness by the Law; but this was a fatal error, causing them to reject the righteousness of God: *for* the Law, regarded as a way of attaining to righteousness before God, is at an end in Christ, and gives place to the righteousness of faith.

Christ is the end of the Law, as "death is the end of life" (τέλος τοῦ βίου θάνατος: Demosth. 1306, 25).

This most common and simple meaning of τέλος is required by the emphatic contrast between law and faith in the beginning and end of the sentence, and also by the whole context, which describes the righteousness of faith as opposed to the righteousness that is of the law, not as the completion, nor as the aim of the law.

In this passage it is *not grammatically wrong* to render νόμου, without the article, "the Law:" see Introduction, § 9. But it is better to interpret it as "**law**" in general, the principle which says "*This do, and thou shalt live.*" In this sense, "**law**" is abolished in Christ, and the purpose of its abolition is expressed in the words "*for righteousness to every one that believeth.*"

For other interpretations, see Note at the end of the Chapter.

*for righteousness to every one that believeth.*] This is the purpose of the abolition of "**law**" in Christ. If "**law**" remained in force as the condition of righteousness, then righteousness could not be extended "*to every one that believeth,*" but only to those who were under law and only if they were "doers of law" (ii. 13).

5–10. Moses bears witness to the Righteousness of Faith.

5. *the righteousness which is of the law,*] Read, *the righteousness which is* **of law**, and for the various readings of *v.* 5 see the note at the end of the chapter.

*the man which doeth those things*] "*The man which doeth* **them**."

In Lev. xviii. 5 God says, "*Ye shall therefor ekeep my statutes, and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them.*"

The Septuagint, from which St. Paul quotes the passage exactly, reads in the former part of the verse "*Ye shall therefore keep* **all** *my statutes and* **all** *my judgments.*" Thus in the keeping of all "*statutes*" and "*judgments*" the Apostle sees a description of "*the righteousness which is* **of law**," and in the clause "*which if a man do*" he finds a condition which cannot be perfectly fulfilled by fallen man, and which therefore condemns one who depends on his own fulfilment of the law for justification before God.

That this is St. Paul's meaning is clear from the context in *vv.* 3, 4, and from the whole tenor of this Epistle (ii. 13, iii. 20, &c.), as well as from the earlier quotation of the same passage in Gal. iii. 12, where the meaning is put beyond doubt by another quotation, "*Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them*" (Deut. xxvii. 26).

But in assuming that the condition, "*if a man do them,*" is impracticable, St. Paul seems exactly to reverse the natural meaning of the words of Moses. *Either* those words really mean that God's law given to Israel consisted of statutes and judgments which *might be kept* and by keeping which they should enter into life: *or else* they are nothing better than an ironical promise based upon an impossible condition. The latter thought cannot be for a moment entertained: for it is God Himself who speaks through Moses, repeating the commandment and the promise twice, and confirming them by the most solemn formula of Divine attestation, "*I am*

Digitized by Google

[n Lev. 18. 5. Ezek. 20. 11. Gal. 3. 12.] eousness which is of the law, [n]That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.

6 But the righteousness which is [n Deut. 30. 12.] of faith speaketh on this wise, [n]Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down *from above*:)

7 Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.)

8 But what saith it? [o]The word [o Deut. 30. 14.]

---

*the* LORD." The references to the passage by Ezekiel (xx. 11, 13, 21) and Nehemiah (ix. 13, 29) clearly show that in their view the condition was not impracticable nor the promise unattainable.

Did then St. Paul misrepresent or misunderstand the passage? Not St. Paul himself, but those unbelieving Jews, whose error he was exposing.

To one who sincerely desired "*to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God*" (Mic. vi. 8), "the law," taken in its fulness and in its spirit, was undoubtedly a path of righteousness and life. It was a revelation of God Himself and of His holy will, accompanied by a dispensation full of the means of grace, of pardon, and reconciliation for every humble and contrite soul, full also of types and promises leading on to Christ.

But the Pharisees, and under their guidance the mass of the people, did not thus regard "*the Law*:" to them it was "**law**" and nothing more, a covenant of works as opposed to a covenant of grace, its promise of life depending on the merit of strict and scrupulous obedience. Such a view has only to be pushed to its legitimate conclusion in order to confute itself: and this is what St. Paul does: "If you would attain to righteousness by '*the law*' merely as '**law**,' then it must be fulfilled to the very letter. Keep *all* the statutes, and *all* the judgments fully and perfectly, and then you shall 'find life in them.'"

St. Paul's method is in fact the same as our Lord's: his answer to those who are seeking "*the righteousness which is* **of law**" is "This do, and thou shalt live" (Luke x. 28). He reminds them, as it were, that "*whosoever shall keep the* whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (Ja. ii. 10): he uses the words of the Law as they were used by those who rejected "*the righteousness which is of faith*:" he means, as in Gal. iii. 21, that there is no law which simply *as law* can give life, and therefore no such thing as a "*righteousness which is* **of law**."

**6.** *But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise,*] For a similar personification and self-description of Wisdom, see Prov. i. 20, and Heb. xii. 5. Apart from the figure, the meaning is that Moses thus speaks concerning "*the righteousness which is of faith*." Thus both parts of *v.* 4 are proved by the testimony of Moses—the impossibility of being justified by law in *v.* 5, and the reality and nearness of the righteousness of faith in *vv.* 6–8.

But where does St. Paul find "the righteousness of faith" in the words of Moses? In Deuteronomy, "the book of Moses, which has been regarded almost as an evangelization of the law" (Jowett). Observe also that in Deut. xxx. 11–14, Moses speaks to those to whom he has previously said in *v.* 6, "*God will circumcise thine heart, . . . to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live*:" that is to say, Moses is speaking to the truly penitent and faithful Israelites. And as St. Paul found "*the righteousness of faith*" in Abraham, who believed God, so here he finds its very essence in one who loves God, and turns to Him with all his heart and soul (Deut. xxx. 6–10).

*Say not in thine heart.*] This is found in Deut. viii. 17, and ix. 4, and is substituted by St. Paul for the one word, "*to say*," in Deut. xxx. 12: "*It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say* [lit. 'to say'], *Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?*"

"To say in the heart" is a Hebrew idiom meaning "to think," especially to think perverse unholy thoughts, which one is ashamed to speak out (Philippi): compare Deut. xv. 9, xviii. 21; Ps. xiv. 1; Matt. xxiv. 48; Rev. xviii. 7.

Moses thus vindicates God's commandment as not being beyond man's reach, but already brought near and made plain to him: in Baruch iii. 29, similar language is applied to wisdom.

*that is, to bring Christ down.*] As Moses forbids the Israelite to say, We want some one to bring God's word down nearer to us, so "*the righteousness of faith*" says to us, "Doubt not that Christ has already come down."

The words, "*from above*," are a needless addition in the A. V.: the parenthesis, too, is unnecessary, the citations and comments being clearly distinguished without it.

**7.** *Or, Who shall descend into the deep?*] Deut. xxx. 13: "*Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us,*" *&c.* This is a second figure by

Digitized by Google

is nigh thee, *even* in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach;

9 That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

10 For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

---

which Moses declares that God's commandment is not inaccessible: but St. Paul, in applying the passage to Christ, brought still nearer to us by the resurrection, changes the idea of crossing the sea into that of going down into "**the abyss**:" and by "the abyss" he means not the deep of the sea, but the abode of the dead, "*the depths of the earth*," Ps. lxxi. 20: ἐκ τῶν ἀβύσσων τῆς γῆς πάλιν ἀνήγαγές με, a passage which seems to have been in St. Paul's mind, and to have suggested the words ἄβυσσος and πάλιν ἀναγαγεῖν.

8. *But what saith it?*] As if the negative in *v.* 6 had been joined with λέγει: "the righteousness which is of faith saith not, Who shall ascend, &c.? But what saith it?"

*The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart.*] "And yet what need is there either of long journeys over the land, or of long voyages, for the sake of investigating and seeking out virtue, the roots of which the Creator has laid not at any great distance, but so near, as the wise Lawgiver of the Jews says, 'They are in thy mouth, and in thy heart, and in thy hands,' intimating by these figurative expressions the words, and actions, and designs of men" (Philo, 'The Virtuous is Free,' c. x.).

St. Paul omits the words "and in thy hands" added to the original by the LXX, and the concluding words of Deut. xxx. 14, "*that thou mayest do it*," which are less suited to his argument. "The Apostle quotes without regard to verbal exactness, apparently because he is dwelling rather on the truth that he is expounding, than on the words in which it is conveyed, not verifying references by a book, but speaking from the fulness of the heart" (Jowett).

*That is, the word of faith, which we preach.*] The word that is very nigh, in the mouth and in the heart, is essentially the same as "*the word* which speaks *of faith*," *i.e.* the gospel which announces "*faith*" as the principle of righteousness.

"*Faith*" is not here used in its objective sense (τῆς πίστεως) (Gal. i. 23), "the faith," *i.e.* the Christian faith; but the article is required by the mention of "faith" in the context, and cannot be translated.

9. *That if thou shalt confess.*] The contents of "*the word of faith which we preach*" are here shown to correspond with the teaching of Deuteronomy. The rendering, "for if thou shalt believe," makes this *proof* of correspondence more formal, but is not necessary.

The correspondence itself lies in the consent of heart and mouth required both by Moses and by the preachers of "*the word of faith*."

*the Lord Jesus.*] "**That Jesus is Lord**": the Vatican MS. gives the same sense in a different form, derived probably from the parallel passages, 1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11. "In this appellation (Jesus the Lord) lies the sum of faith and salvation" (Bengel). The reference to *v.* 6, "*Who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down*," shows that Jesus is here called Lord, not simply as the exalted Head of the Church (compare Eph. iv. 9–11), but as the only-begotten Son of God, "*the Lord from heaven*" (1 Cor. xv. 47).

*that God hath raised him from the dead.*] This answers to *v.* 7. The Deity of Christ, and His resurrection, are the chief objects of justifying faith (i. 4; iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 17, &c.).

10. The mention in Deut. of "*mouth*" and "*heart*" having been interpreted by St. Paul of confession and faith, he now shows that this interpretation is in accordance with the general principles of the Christian dispensation, in which belief of the heart and confession by the mouth are both required. "*Heart*" and "*mouth*," the emphatic words in each sentence, are now placed in their natural order.

Justification and salvation are here distinguished as in v. 9, where see note. Salvation presupposes a continuance of the faith which justifies, and a consequent realisation of the effects of faith, of which confession is one: see Barrow on the Creed, Sermon V. towards the end.

Looking back upon the whole passage (*vv.* 5–10) we may ask, Does St. Paul regard the *words* of Moses as a *prediction* of the nature of the righteousness of faith to be subsequently revealed? (Fritzsche, p. 389.) Or does he mean that besides the plain grammatical and historical sense of the words of Moses, there is also an *indirect allegorical and typical sense* which foreshadows the subsequent revelation of the righteousness of faith? (Meyer.) Or does the Apostle merely make a free use of the words of Moses to clothe his own thoughts? Is there

Digitized by Google

[p] Is. 28. 16

11 For the scripture saith, [p]Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.

12 For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.

13 [q]For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

[q] Joel 2. 32. Acts 2. 21.

---

nothing more than a graceful allusion (Bengel), "a holy and beautiful play of God's Spirit upon the word of the Lord?" (Philippi, Van Hengel.)

Better than any of these explanations is the view held by Augustine that the words of Moses, understood in their true spiritual sense, describe a righteousness which is essentially the righteousness of faith ('de Nat. et Gratia,' § 83.

Moses is in fact describing a religion of the heart: "*The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live*" (*v.* 6). To one who thus turns with heart and soul to the Lord obedience is easy; "*the word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart.*" This, says St. Paul, is in substance "*the word of faith, which we preach.*"

St. Paul's explanation is not allegorical but spiritual: "it penetrates through the letter of the O. T. to its spirit" (Olshausen), and that is the spirit of the Gospel.

### 11–13. The Righteousness of Faith is for All.

**11.** On the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. 16, see above ix. 33: by repeating it here St. Paul both confirms the preceding description of "*the righteousness which is of faith,*" and passes on to the further thought that this righteousness is free for all. The statement in Isaiah is unlimited, "*he that believeth*"; and St. Paul by the addition of one word (πᾶς) makes it expressly universal, "**every one that believeth,**" and also definite "*believeth on him,*" *i. e.* on Christ.

**12.** The universality thus emphatically given to the statement of Isaiah is now justified on the ground that the condition, "*he that believeth,*" makes no distinction between Jew and Greek (compare iii. 22); and the cause of this unlimited bestowal of blessing is traced to the bounty of its Divine Author. The promise in Isaiah of the "precious corner stone" is Messianic, and therefore really universal, God's mercy in Christ embracing all the nations of the earth.

*for the same Lord over all is rich, &c.*] Rather, "**For the same is Lord of all, being rich** *unto all that call upon him.*" That Christ, not God the Father, is here called "**Lord of all,**" is clear from *v.* 9, as well as from such passages as ch. xiv. 9, Phil. ii. 11, Acts x. 36.

The universality of justification by faith, which is proved in ch. iii. 30, from the truth that "*it is one God,*" the God both of Jews and Gentiles, who shall justify both, is here in like manner shown from the fact that there is one and the same "**Lord of all,**" who is rich unto all "in grace and salvation which no multitude can exhaust" (Bengel): compare 1 Tim. ii. 5.

*all that call upon him.*] In like manner St. Paul designates Christians in 1 Cor. i. 2 as "*all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*": compare 2 Tim. ii. 22.

"That calling on God, whereon salvation depends, is not in words only, but in heart and deed. For what the heart believeth, the mouth confesseth, the hand in deed fulfilleth" (Hugo de S. Vict. quoted by Pusey on Joel, ii. 32).

**13.** To "*call upon the Lord*" means to worship Him, and therefore, among other things included in true worship, to confess Him with the mouth, as in *vv.* 9, 10, and the expression thus prepares the way for the Scriptural proof of the statement that "*with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.*" This proof is quoted exactly in the words of the LXX from the great prophecy of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Joel ii. 32, "*Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered* (**saved**)." The words "*all flesh*" (Joel ii. 28) show that Gentiles are included in the prophecy. See note on the passage.

This is one of the strongest passages in favour of addressing prayer to Christ. It is admitted that to "*call upon the name of the Lord*" means in the original passage to pray to Jehovah as God.

It is also admitted that the "Lord of all" in *v.* 12 is Christ: and that St. Paul refers the word "Lord," which in the original points to *God*, justly to *Christ*, whose name is now the very specific object of the *Christian* calling on the Lord.

With these admissions there is little real significance left in Meyer's fine-drawn distinction between "*worshipping absolutely*, as it takes place only in respect of the Father as the One absolute God," and "worship according to that relativity in the consciousness of the worshipper, which is conditioned by the

Digitized by Google

14 How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?

15 And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, [r]How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!

[r] Is. 52. 7. Nah. 1. 15.

16 But they have not all obeyed

---

relation of Christ to *the Father*, whose Son of like nature, whose image, partner of the Throne, Mediator and Advocate on the part of men, He is."

### 14–21. The Gospel preached to all rejected by Israel.

This passage brings another proof that the fault of Israel's exclusion lies in themselves. From the nature of the salvation just described, it follows that the Gospel must be preached to all without distinction. But this very freedom of *the offer of salvation to every believer*, was a stumbling-block to the unbelieving Jews, as the Apostle's experience had often proved (Acts xiii. 45–47, xviii. 6, xxviii. 28). St. Paul, as usual, closely connects this new topic with the preceding context: commenting, as it were, upon the words of Joel, "**Every one** *whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord*," he argues first that "*the name of the Lord*" to be invoked must be believed, and thereto must be heard, and thereto proclaimed, and thereto preachers must be sent, according to Isaiah lii. 7 (*vv.* 14, 15).

The Gospel being thus preached, if "*not all*," to wit, not Israel, have obeyed it (*v.* 16), they have neither the excuse of not having heard (*v.* 18), nor of not having known that the invitation was to be preached to all nations, but the fault lies in their own perversity (*vv.* 19–21).

**14.** *How then*] Each question in the chain is an argument, the conclusion of which is tacitly assumed, and forms the ground of the next question, *e.g.* "How can they call upon the Lord unless they believe on Him? They cannot: therefore they must first believe. How can they believe, if they have not heard? they cannot:" and so on.

*of whom they have not heard.*] Rather, "**Whom** *they have not heard*:" in Ephes. iv. 21, on the contrary, we ought to read, "*if ye have heard* **of** *Him*." Here, as in Eph. ii. 17, the Lord is heard speaking through His messengers, as is shown in the next question.

**15.** *except they be sent?*] By whom? By the same Lord (*v.* 13) whose name they proclaim.

In N. T. the Father "*sends*" the Son, and the Son "*sends*" His Apostles: their mission includes all ministry derived from them. Compare Luke ix. 2, x. 1, 3; John iv. 38, xvii. 18; Acts xxvi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 17.

St. Paul argues back from effect to cause, through the series of Prayer, Faith, Hearing, Preaching, Sending: thus the last link in his argument must be the first in the realisation, from which the rest follow: this one, therefore, he confirms by the prophetic announcement in Isa. lii. 7, of the going forth of the Gospel messengers: "*How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation.*" The prophecy rings with a joy like that which the Apostle himself felt in contemplating the spread of the Gospel throughout the world.

St. Paul quotes the passage freely and briefly, omitting what belongs simply to the poetic colouring—"*upon the mountains*," turns the collective singular, "*him that bringeth good tidings*," into the plural, and omits the words "*that publisheth salvation*."

*that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good!*] Rather, **That bring glad tidings** *of peace*, **that** *bring glad tidings of good*. The repetition of the same word in the Hebrew, and in the Greek, ought to be preserved in the English translation. See the note at the end of the chapter, and the notes on Isaiah, and compare Nahum i. 15.

In the foreshortened perspective of prophecy the return from the captivity in Babylon, to which the passage of Isaiah primarily refers, seems to be coincident with the coming of Messiah, which it symbolises and prepares. The progress of time had shown St. Paul the distinction between the partial or typical and the complete fulfilment which he here rightly affirms.

"*How beautiful are the feet*" means simply, "*how welcome is the coming*."

**16.** *But they have not all obeyed the Gospel.*] Rather, "**But they did not all obey the glad tidings.**"

The messengers were sent, "Isaiah in spirit saw their glad steps" (Bengel); God's part was done: *But*, notwithstanding this, they did not all hearken to and obey (2 Thess. i. 8) the Gospel message.

The message was addressed to all, but the Jews as a nation (for St. Paul is here speaking of them nationally, not individually) did not

Digitized by Google

[a] Is. 53. 1. John 12. 38. ‖ Gr. *the hearing of us.* ‖ Or, *preaching.*

the gospel. For Esaias saith, [a]Lord, who hath believed ‖our ‖report?

17 So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

18 But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, [b]their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

[b] Ps. 19. 4

submit to the requirement of faith and calling upon the Lord. Some commentators suppose the statement "they did not all obey" to refer to the Gentiles, but this is contrary to the tenor of the whole context: St. Paul is dealing in this chapter with the unbelief of the Jews, not of the Gentiles, and the words which he cites from Isaiah, refer in their primary sense to Israel, as distinguished from Gentiles, and are expressly applied to the Jews by St. John, xii. 38: see the notes on Isai. liii. 1.

*For Esaias saith,*] The disobedience of the Jews was an event foreseen in God's counsel: it was so to be, for Isaiah foretells it: compare John xii. 38, "*Yet they believed not on Him: that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report?*"

"*Our report,*" literally, "the hearing of us" (Margin), *i.e.* the message heard from us. The Prophet is lamenting not merely the disbelief of his own age, but, in close connection with the passage above quoted (in which he foresees the coming of Him "that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth") he goes on to speak in the close of ch. lii. of the servant of God, who shall first be abased and then exalted; and then in ch. liii. 1, he sees and mourns over the disbelief of his own message, and the consequent rejection of Messiah. The word "*Lord,*" added here and in the Greek versions of Isai. liii. 1, shows the prophet turning to Jehovah, as the sender of the message, to complain of the incredulity with which it is received. The addition is in harmony with the original meaning of the passage, and with St. Paul's comment upon it in *v.* 17.

"*Who hath believed?*" Instead of saying, with literal accuracy, "How few?" the Prophet, followed by the Apostle, overlooks the few faithful ones in his passionate grief over the mass of unbelievers.

**17.** *by hearing*] Rather, "**from hearing.**" Again, as in *v.* 14, St. Paul comments on the words quoted, and from the question, "Who hath *believed* the message *heard* from us?" draws a confirmation of his argument in *vv.* 14, 15, for the necessary dependence of faith upon the hearing and preaching of the Gospel. He thus brings out more clearly the ground of the objection which follows in *v.* 18.

"*Hearing*" must mean, as in *v.* 16, "the message heard," and this comes from the message sent, which is "*The word of God*" (ῥῆμα Θεοῦ). This last expression, therefore, does not mean precisely "God's bidding," His command to the preachers to go forth, a meaning for which Meyer appeals to Luke iii. 2, iv. 4, v. 5; Heb. i. 3, xi. 3; but the message with which they are sent from God, and which of course implies the sending spoken of in *v.* 15. Compare John iii. 34: "*He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God*"; and John xvii. 8: "*I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.*" "*The words of God*" (ῥήματα) prove the sending.

In the passage of Isaiah, "*our report,*" *i.e.* *the message heard from us*, includes both the hearing and preaching of *v.* 14, and therefore preaching, though not expressly named, is implied in the sequence *faith, hearing, the word of God.* This view is confirmed by *v.* 18, where the question, "Have they (the *hearers*) not heard?" is answered by "their sound (*the preachers'*) went forth."

The sending of the preachers by God is derived from the quotation not as an inference "from the mere address '*Lord,*' which is only added by LXX, but rather from the whole attitude of the Prophet as the servant and ambassador of God, speaking by His word or command" (Meyer). On the various reading "word of Christ" see note at end.

**18.** *But I say,*] After showing generally what was necessary in order that man might believe, the Apostle now inquires into the possible excuses that might be made for the unbelief of the Jews, and refutes them from their own scriptures.

*Have they not heard?*] Better, "**Is it that they did not hear?**" The form of the question in Greek shows at once that the excuse cannot be admitted: "Surely the message did not remain unheard by them?" (Meyer).

*Yes verily,*] Rather, "**Nay verily:**" see ix. 20. The answer *corrects* the suggestion "that they did *not* hear," by asserting that the Gospel has been preached in all the world. This assertion the Apostle clothes in the words of Ps. xix. 4. In the Psalm "*their sound*" is the voice of nature, the silent witness with which "*the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handywork.*" The Psalmist compares this universal revelation of

Digitized by Google

19 But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, [x] I will provoke you to jealousy by *them that are* no people, *and* by a foolish nation I will anger you.

[x] Deut. 32. 21.

20 But Esaias is very bold, and saith, [z] I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.

[z] Is. 65. 1.

21 But to Israel he saith, [y] All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

[y] Is. 65. 2.

---

God in His works (*vv.* 1–6) with His special revelation of Himself in His word (*vv.* 7–11); and the Apostle catches the very spirit of the Psalmist when he uses his words to describe how "*the sound*" of the preachers of the Gospel "*is gone out into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the world.*" The poetical language thus borrowed from the Psalm must not, of course, be pressed with literal exactness; its use was justified by the great extent to which the Gospel had already been diffused throughout the world, and everywhere addressed to the Jews first. At the date of this Epistle, the Gospel had been preached almost in every place where a settled body of Jews were living, so that even those of the Dispersion had not the excuse of not having heard it.

**19–21.** Another possible excuse suggested, and refuted by Scripture.

**19.** *But I say,*] Observe the "emphatic conformity" (Meyer) gained by repeating the words, "*But I say,*" from *v.* 18.

Observe also how in the increasing urgency and closeness of the question St. Paul expressly names "*Israel,*" whom he had meant in *v.* 16, "*they have not all obeyed the Gospel.*" In the right order of the Greek words (Tischendorf 8), "**Israel**" is emphatic.

*Did not Israel know?*] Rather, "**Did Israel not know?**" "Was it that they heard, but did not perceive the meaning of the things spoken?" (Chrysostom). Did they not understand that the message of salvation was to be sent to every nation, and that the Gentiles would receive it gladly? They knew this from the very beginning, for the first to declare it (πρῶτος) is Moses himself.

In the song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 21) the voice of God is heard declaring that as Israel had moved Him to jealousy by worshipping that which is "not God," so He on His part will make them jealous by showing favour to them which are "no-people," *i.e.* to those who were not included in the special covenant by which God had made Israel His own people (Ex. xix. 6; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2).

Both the figure and language of Moses are repeated by Hosea (i. 9, ii. 2, 23). Compare c. ix. 25; 1 Pet. ii. 10.

*by them that are no people,*] Rather, "**against that which is no people.**" The quotation is from the LXX, who have neglected the distinction in the Hebrew between "*people*" and "*nation:*" this is rightly restored in the A. V.

Since "*the people of God*" alone answers to the true idea of a "*people,*" any "*nation*" that knows not God contradicts this idea and is a "*not people*" (Lo-ammi). St. Paul makes the application more direct and personal by changing "*I will provoke them*" into "*I will provoke you.*" See Notes on Deut. xxxii. 21.

*and by a foolish nation.*] Rather, **against a nation void of understanding:** *i.e.* I will stir you to anger by taking into my favour those who have hitherto shown their foolishness by worshipping idols of wood and stone.

St. Paul rightly regards the Divine warning uttered by Moses as intended for every age of Israel's history, and therefore applies it to the acceptance of the Gospel by Greeks and Romans and other idolatrous Gentiles in his own day: comp. i. 21.

**20.** *But Esaias is very bold.*] Rather, "**But Esaias breaks out boldly.**" The quotation is from Isaiah lxv. 1: "*I am sought of them that asked not for me: I am found of them that sought me not.*"

St. Paul retains the words of the LXX, but inverts the order of the parallel clauses, thereby bringing into greater prominence that one which more clearly expresses the reception of the Gentiles, "*I was found of them that sought me not.*" That the original passage in its primary sense refers to the Heathen, and *not* (as Meyer and others assert) to the Jews, seems clear from comparing the words, "*a nation that was not called by my name*" (lxv. 1) with lxiii. 19, "*We are thine: thou never barest rule over them: they were not called by thy name.*" [See this Commentary on the passage.] The tenses cannot in Isaiah refer to events already past, as no Heathen nation had then been brought in: they are the usual tenses of prophecy, anticipating its fulfilment, which in St. Paul's day was already an accomplished fact.

"*Asked not after me,*" *i.e.* who inquired not of me, but of other gods. Compare Num. xxvii. 21; Josh. ix. 14; Jud. i. 1; xx. 18; Isaiah viii. 19; xix. 3.

**21.** *But to Israel,*] "But in reference to

Digitized by Google

Israel," or more briefly, "**But of Israel.**" On this use of πρός see Luke xx. 19, "*against*," rather "**concerning,**" and Heb. i. 8, "unto the Son," rather, "**of the Son.**"

The direct address *to Israel* does not begin till Isa. lxv. 7.

"*he saith*," namely, Isaiah speaking in God's name.

"*All day long I have stretched forth my hands.*" "**All the day long I have spread out my hands.**" It is a picture of "*the everlasting arms*" spread open in unwearied love: St. Paul again changes the order, giving more emphasis to the words "**all the day long,**" which express God's patience and long-suffering towards His own people (λαόν), though they persist in disobeying and refusing His invitations.

The idea of the whole chapter is briefly summed up in these last words.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 4, 15, 17.

**4.** Besides the meaning of τέλος given in the foot-note, two other senses have been ascribed to it; (1) completion, (2) aim.

(1) "Christ is the completion (perfectio) of the law, and Christ is righteousness:—and he who receives not Christ, cannot complete even that righteousness which is of the law." (Origen: Cyril, πλήρωμα; Erasmus, "perfectio;" Calvin, "complementum;" Calovius, "Christ's fulfilment and satisfaction of the law by His active and passive obedience."

But this sense of completion is wrongly ascribed to τέλος even in 1 Tim. i. 5, and Ja. v. 11: as to Luke xxii. 37, compare Mark iii. 26.

(2) "This then was the end of the law, and to this all looked, the feasts, and the ordinances, and the sacrifices, that man might be justified. "But this end Christ accomplished in a greater way through faith .... so that if you believe Him, you have also fulfilled the law even much more fully than it commanded, for you have received a much greater righteousness" (Chrysostom, Gennadius).

This sense of τέλος is found in 1 Pet. i. 9, and 1 Tim. i. 5; it has also been explained in another way, as follows:

"The law was given for this purpose to lead us by the hand to another righteousness: yea, in all that the law teaches, enjoins, or promises, it always has Christ for its aim" (Calvin, following Theodoret, Cyril, &c.).

All these interpretations are inconsistent with the context, which sets "*the righteousness which is* **of law**" in direct opposition to "*the righteousness which is of faith.*"

**15.** The omission of the former clause, τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, is approved by Lachmann, Tisch. 8, and Tregelles; but Meyer regards it as a copyist's error of a very usual kind. An interpolator would have taken the words of the LXX ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, not εἰρήνην. Moreover, the genuineness of εἰρήνην is confirmed by St. Paul's allusions to the same passage in Eph. ii. 17, καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην, and in Eph. vi. 15, ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης.

**17.** The various reading διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ has about equal weight of authority, and is preferred by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. But Meyer, De Wette, Lange, Philippi, &c., agree in regarding it as a gloss intended to define more precisely the meaning of διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ.

## CHAPTER XI.

1 *God hath not cast off all Israel.* 7 *Some were elected, though the rest were hardened.* 16 *There is hope of their conversion.* 18 *The Gentiles may not insult upon them:* 26 *for there is a promise of their salvation.* 33 *God's judgments are unsearchable.*

I SAY then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, *of* the tribe of Benjamin.

2 God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye

### CHAP. XI.—THE RESTORATION.

**1.** *I say then, Hath God cast away his people?*] A third question, corresponding to those in x. 18, 19, but expressed as an inference from what has just been said of Israel's disobedience—an inference, however, which is only brought forward to be at once rejected, as the very form of the question (μή) shows—"Surely God has not cast off His people?" Can it be that the reception of the Gentiles means that Israel is cast off and excluded from the promised salvation? Can God have dealt thus with *His own people?* That very title anticipated the answer, "for the Lord will not fail *his people*, neither will he forsake his inheritance" (Ps. xciv. 14): compare 1 Sam. xii. 22.

On the expression, "*God forbid*," see iii. 4.

Digitized by Google

not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying,

[a] 1 Kings 19. 14.

3 [a]Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

4 But what saith the answer of God unto him? [b]I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to *the image of* Baal.

[b] 1 Kings 19. 18.

5 Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace

---

It is not a *denial* followed by its *proof*, but an earnest *deprecation* explained by its *motive*: "*For I also am an Israelite.*" No true Israelite could bear the thought that God had cast away His people: and St. Paul, in feeling as in blood, was a very Hebrew of the Hebrews, "*of the seed of Abraham*," and not a mere proselyte,—"*of the tribe of Benjamin*," which alone with Judah formed the core of the Theocracy at the division of the kingdom and after the captivity: compare Phil. iii. 5.

**2.** The direct denial here follows, and is strengthened by the further description of Israel as God s "*people which he foreknew.*"

The subject of the whole chapter from *v.* 1 is the *national* destiny of the Jews. This forbids us to limit God's "*people whom he foreknew*" to a spiritual Israel, foreknown and predestined to be saved through their reception of the Gospel.

The true meaning is that Israel the nation —"*all Israel*" (*v.* 26)—is God's "*people which he foreknew*" *as his people*: His people, therefore, Israel still is, and must be for ever; it cannot have been cast away, "*for the gifts and calling of G d are without repentance*" (*v.* 29).

*Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias?*] Rather, "**Or know ye not what the scripture saith in [the history of] Elias?**"

On the introductory phrase, "**Or know ye not,**" see vi. 16: it means here, You must admit that "*God has not cast away his people,*" or else you must be strangely ignorant of what the Scripture says in proof of this in another similar case.

"**In Elias.**" Elias is here the name of the Parashah, or section of the Hebrew Scriptures, concerning Elias. These sections were originally denoted not by numbers, but by a brief description of the contents: thus Philo Jud. 'de Agricultura Noachi' xxiv., "in the curses" (Gen. iii. 15); Raschi on Ps. ii., "as is said in Abner" (2 Sam. ii. 8 ff.); and on Hos. ix. 9, "in the concubine" (Jud. xix.); Berachoth f. 2, c. 1, "in Michael" (Is. vi. 6) f. 4, c. 2, "in Gabriel" (Dan. ix. 21).

*maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, &c.*] Rather, **pleadeth with God against Israel: Lord, &c.** "*Intercession*" is never against, but always on behalf of some one.

**3.** The passage is quoted freely from 1 Ki. xix. 10 and 14: for the particulars see the Notes there given in this Commentary.

The assumption that Elijah means, "I am left alone *of the prophets*," is inconsistent with the context, which certainly does not speak of seven thousand *prophets*, but of seven thousand faithful worshippers of Jehovah: so Theodoret. There is thus no diversity between Elijah's meaning and St. Paul's application of his words.

**4.** *the answer of God*] The Greek word (χρηματισμός) thus rightly rendered means a "communication," either from man (2 Macc. xi. 17), or from God (2 Macc. ii. 4). Here it is the answer made by the "*still small voice.*"

*I have reserved to myself.*] Rather, "**I have left for myself.**" I have caused a *remnant* (*v.* 5) to remain.

The passage in its original context (1 Kings xix. 18) stands in connexion with the future chastisements which Israel was to suffer by the agency of Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha: but amid this destruction of the disobedient, "*I have left*," God says, or rather, as in the margin, "*I will leave*," "*seven thousand*," *i.e.* I have in my purpose already determined not to destroy them with the disobedient. St. Paul brings the passage into immediate connexion with the Prophet's lament that he is left alone: there were, unknown to him, many true worshippers of Jehovah, whom God would leave as a remnant, when the wicked should perish.

"*seven thousand*" is to be regarded as a round number. There is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to the words "*for myself*" (ἐμαυτῷ), which St. Paul adds to bring out more emphatically the thought that the remnant is preserved by God Himself for His own gracious purpose. The way is thus prepared for the mention of an "*election of grace*" in *v.* 5.

*who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.*] Rather, **which have not bowed knee to Baal.** The Apostle gives here a free paraphrase, and brings into prominence the characteristic of the remnant preserved: they are men that (οἵτινες) never bowed knee to Baal.

On the feminine τῇ Βάαλ, see notes on Jud. ii. 13, x. 6; 1 Sam. vii. 4; Hos. ii. 8, 10, 15, and Jeremiah, *passim*.

Digitized by Google

6 And if by grace, then *is it* no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be* of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest [1]were blinded.

8 (According as it is written, [c]God hath given them the spirit of [1]slumber, [d]eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.

[1] Or, *hardened.*
[c] Is. 29. 10.
[1] Or, *remorse.*
[d] Is. 6. 9.

---

**5.** *Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.*] The Greek word (καιρός) denotes *the character of a time*, and St. Paul likens his own time to Elijah's, because each was a season of general but not universal apostasy and unbelief in Israel. The resemblance of the times shows that God is dealing with Israel upon the same principles; and so from the Divine answer to Elijah the Apostle draws the inference (οὖν) that in his time also God has left a remnant *for himself*, in other words, "*there* **has come to be** (γέγονεν) *a remnant according to* **an** *election*" not of merit, but "*of grace.*"

The existence of this "*remnant*" of believing Jews is the proof that God has not rejected His people *as a people* (*v.* 2).

**6.** *And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.*] Rather, "*And if by grace,* **it is** *no more of works:* **since otherwise the grace becomes no longer** *grace.*" The negative as well as the positive side of the election of grace is essential to the inference which St. Paul draws in the next verse: for Israel seeks to obtain "*of works*" that which is not of works: compare ix. 32. "**The grace**" presupposed in the election of the remnant excludes all dependence upon works, for otherwise it ceases to be "*grace*" at all, losing its proper character as the opposite of merit.

The latter part of the verse, "*But if it be of works,*" *&c.*, is rightly omitted in most critical texts.

**7.** *What then?*] What conclusion as to the present state of Israel must be drawn from the truths just stated?

*Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for.*] Rather, "**What Israel is seeking after, that obtained he not.**" Israel, the mass of the people, has been and still is seeking after righteousness, the very thing that he has failed to obtain. St. Paul does not stay to define the object which Israel seeks, nor to state that he sought it not aright, because this has been done before in ix. 32 and x. 3, and the principles asserted in those passages have just been most emphatically repeated in *v.* 6.

It is thus made clear that the believing Jews are saved, like the Gentiles, "*by grace through faith*" (Eph. ii. 8), and that "*the rest were* **hardened,**" not because God had "*rejected his people,*" but because they sought to establish their own righteousness by works, and "**submitted not** *unto the righteousness of God*" (x. 3).

*the election.*] The Abstract Noun gives precision of thought, as well as vivacity and force of expression: "the elect *as elect*" (Bengel).

*were blinded.*] Rather, "**were hardened.**" Compare 2 Cor. iii. 14, and see note on Mark iii. 5, and at the end of this chapter. That God is here regarded as the author of the hardening, is clear from the Scripture proof that follows.

**8.** St. Paul now shows that the hardening of Israel against the Gospel is in accordance with the testimony of Moses concerning their hardening in his day, and with Isaiah's prophecy of the continuance of this hardening. Compare Isaiah vi. 9, 10.

Two passages are in the Apostle's mind: Isaiah xxix. 9, 10: "*They are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink. For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes*": and Deut. xxix. 4: "*Yet the Lord* HATH NOT GIVEN YOU *an heart to perceive, and* EYES TO SEE, AND EARS TO HEAR, UNTO THIS DAY."

The quotation is evidently taken from the latter passage, with the expression "*the spirit of slumber,*" adopted from Isaiah, and a corresponding change in the position of the negative, on which see below.

The words "*unto this day*" are part of the quotation from Deuteronomy, and are not to be directly connected with *v.* 7: the brackets of A. V. must therefore be omitted.

*the spirit of slumber,*] Meyer understands by this "a spirit which *causes* stupefaction, which is obviously a daemonic spirit." But such expressions as "*the spirit of heaviness*" (Is. lxi. 3), "*a spirit of meekness*" (1 Cor. iv. 21), "*the spirit of bondage*" (c. viii. 15) show that "*spirit*" is used for the pervading tendency and tone of mind, the special character of which is denoted by the Genitive which follows.

Though it is true that this "*spirit of slumber*" is the result of a "reciprocal process between man's unbelief and God's judgments" (Lange), yet in this passage St. Paul

Digitized by Google

[e] Ps. 69. 22. [f] Ps. 69. 23.

9 And David saith, [e]Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompence unto them:

10 [f]Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.

11 I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but *rather* through their fall

---

speaks only of the judicial hardening, and ascribes this even more expressly than do the original passages to God's will and purpose, by turning the words "*the Lord hath not given you . . . eyes to see*" into the stronger statement, "*God hath given them . . . eyes that they should not see.*" Observe also that the Apostle already had this stronger form of expression before his mind in the quotation which follows from Ps. lxix. 23, 24.

*slumber,*] The Hebrew word in Is. xxix. 10, means "a deep sleep," such as fell on Adam, Gen. ii. 21, on Abraham, Gen. xv. 12, on Saul's attendants, 1 Sam. xxvi. 12: compare Job iv. 13, xxxiii. 15, Prov. xix. 15.

The Greek word (κατανύξεως) might have been applied, like the verb from which it is derived, to any piercing and overpowering stroke, as of remorse (Acts ii. 37), grief, pain, or fear; but it is in fact used only to denote *stupefaction*, in this passage of Isaiah and in Ps. lx. 3 "the wine of astonishment."

**9, 10.** *And David saith.*] On the authorship of Ps. lxix. see note in this commentary. We may add that besides this Psalm (cited here and in Acts i. 20), only the ii., xvi., xxxii., and cx. are expressly ascribed to David in N. T., and the authorship of these is hardly to be questioned. Ps. xcv., quoted in Heb. iv. 7, is less certain, and the form of citation "*saying in David,*" does not necessarily mean more than "saying in the Book of Psalms:" see introductory note on Ps. xcv.

*Let their table be made a snare,*] For the full interpretation of the passage, see notes on the Psalm, and at the end of this chapter. The Psalmist, in the bitterness of a soul wrought almost to madness by the cruelty of his enemies, calls for just vengeance upon them: let their prosperity and false peace be a snare and a trap, to keep them in blindness and in bondage for ever. St. Paul uses the passage, not merely as an illustration, but as a typical Prophecy of the retribution which had fallen upon the Jews for their cruel rejection of the Messiah.

The "*table*" spread for a feast is a natural emblem of the prosperity and careless ease by which the heart is ensnared "as a wild beast grasps at food, and falls into a trap."

**10.** On the "darkening of the eyes" as a figure of the spiritual blindness denounced upon Israel, see Isaiah vi. 9, 10, and the notes there. Fritzsche's view, followed by Godet, that this judicial blindness was the *cause*, not the *consequence*, of the rejection of Christ, is inconsistent with the position of the passage in the Psalm, and the order of ideas there, and especially with the word "*recompense*" or "retribution" (*v.* 9), which St. Paul adopts from the LXX, giving it at the same time a more emphatic place at the end of the sentence.

*And bow down their back alway.*] St. Paul throughout this verse follows the LXX exactly: the Hebrew is rendered literally in the A. V., "make their loins continually to shake." The shaking of the loins is a symptom of weakness and terror (Nahum ii. 10; Dan. v. 6), for which the LXX substitute the corresponding symptom, the bowing down or bending together of the back.

These figurative expressions, when applied to the Jews, denote spiritual blindness and hopeless dejection.

**11-15.** After alleging the fulfilment of prophecy in the hardening of the Jews, St. Paul now shows that the purpose of this Divine retribution is not the final rejection of Israel, but the reconciliation of the world. Their rejection has been shown to be *partial:* it will also be *temporary.*

**11.** *Have they stumbled that they should fall?*] Better, "**Did they stumble in order that they might fall?**"

The two ideas "to stumble" and "to fall" form a natural climax in which the emphasis rests on the latter.

Both words are used figuratively; the former of a moral offence or stumbling, as in James ii. 10, iii. 2, the particular offence here meant being disbelief of Christ, for "*they stumbled at that stumbling stone,*" ix. 32: while the latter word expresses the consequent fall from God's favour into a state of condemnation and ruin: compare Heb. iv. 11 and James v. 12. The meaning then of the verse is briefly this: "The Jews stumbled at Christ: is that stumbling destined in the Divine purpose to end in their fall?"

The form of the question in the Greek (μή) implies the negative answer which follows, "**Far be it,**" or "*God forbid.*"

*but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles.*] Better,—"**But by their offence the salvation is come to the Gentiles.**" The stumbling of the Jews



Digitized by Google

salvation *is come* unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy.

12 Now if the fall of them *be* the riches of the world, and the [1]diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?

13 For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:

14 If by any means I may provoke to emulation *them which are* my flesh, and might save some of them.

[1] Or, *decay*, or, *loss*.

---

is here called "**their offence**," the word being the same that is used so often in ch. v. 15 ff. The rejection by the Jews of the salvation offered to them in Christ, and the increasing violence of their opposition, had in fact greatly promoted the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles (Acts viii. 4, xi. 19) and its consequent acceptance by them. In St. Paul's own experience this had been the case at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 45–48), it was to be so again at Rome itself (Acts xxviii. 28). In this fact he recognises the fulfilment of the Divine purpose foretold in the passage of Deuteronomy already called to mind in x. 19. The transfer of God's favour to the Gentiles, thus caused by the perversity of the Jews, was destined, in His gracious purpose, to provoke the jealousy and so to rekindle the love of His ancient people; their recovery and not their fall was His aim.

But what a prospect is thus opened!

**12.** *Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world,*] Rather, "**But if their offence** *be the riches of the world.*" If even the transgression of the chosen people has brought salvation to the Gentiles, and if their loss or diminution has thus been "*the riches of the world,*" how much more shall the promise of blessing to all nations be fulfilled in their restoration and fulness when "*all Israel shall be saved,*" *v.* 26.

This hope, that the final restoration of Israel shall be a source of great joy and blessing to the world, is here inferred from the nature of the case, that the better cause must be followed by the happier effect: but it is already contained in that prophetic song of Moses, which St. Paul has quoted in x. 19, and which he quotes again in xv. 10 "*Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.*"

*the diminishing of them,*] The contrast throughout is not between the elect remnant and the rest who were hardened, but between Israel as a nation and the rest of the world. Viewed thus, as a whole, Israel has stumbled but not fallen, has been hardened but in part, has suffered loss and *diminution* by the unbelief of some, but shall be restored to its *full complement*, when "*the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.*" *v.* 26.

*their fulness?*] I. e. their full complement, as a nation no longer diminished by the loss of a large portion, but forming again one entire people. See note at the end on the meaning of the Greek words ἥττημα and πλήρωμα.

**13.** St. Paul now turns to his readers, addressing them collectively as Gentiles, and tries to impart to them some of his own warm interest in the welfare of the Jews.

From this point to the end of *v.* 32 the Apostle combines the hope of the restoration of the Jews with warnings to the Gentiles against presuming on their present advantages.

*For I speak to you Gentiles,*] **But to you Gentiles I am speaking.** This clause should be separated from the following by a colon: St. Paul first draws the attention of his readers to the fact that he is speaking to them, as being Gentiles, of that which closely concerns their welfare, namely, the future restoration of Israel.

It is rightly inferred from this passage that the Roman Christians were for the most part Gentiles: see Introduction, § 7.

*inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:*] Rather, "**In so far, therefore, as I am an Apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify my ministry.**"

On the various readings see note at the end. In the words "**In so far as I am an Apostle of the Gentiles,**" St. Paul with his usual delicate courtesy and perfect mastery of Greek, implies that this is but one part (μέν) of his ministry, chosen as he was to bear Christ's name "*before Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel.*" But since the Gentile world is so deeply interested in the restoration of Israel, it follows (**therefore**) that even in his special relation to the Gentiles, when labouring most zealously for them and claiming full liberty and authority for himself as their Apostle, he still has in view the salvation of Israel as inseparably connected with the blessing of all the nations of the world.

**14.** *If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh,*] Rather, "*If by any means I may provoke to* **jealousy mine own flesh and may** *save some of them.*" The word "**jealousy**" should be adopted as in *v.* 11 and x 19; St. Paul retains the same word (παραζηλῶσαι) throughout.

Digitized by Google

15 For if the casting away of them *be* the reconciling of the world, what *shall* the receiving *of them be*, but life from the dead?

16 For if the firstfruit *be* holy, the lump *is* also *holy*: and if the root *be* holy, so *are* the branches.

17 And if some of the branches

---

It may be admitted that the introduction of a different English word, "*emulation*," brings out another shade of meaning, included in the Greek, and quite appropriate here; but this advantage is very small in comparison with the disadvantage of obscuring the connexion with *v.* 11 and with the original prophecy in Deut. xxxii. 16, 21. With the expression of warm affection "**mine own flesh**," compare ix. 3, where the Singular Pronoun "*mine*," not "our," implies what is here expressly stated, that the readers are Gentiles.

St. Paul's sense of the difficulty of persuading his fellow-countrymen is apparent in the modest phrase "*some of them*;" compare 1 Cor. ix. 22. (Meyer.)

**15.** The reason of the Apostle's hope that he "*may save some*" is given in an argument *à fortiori* (compare *v.* 12) based upon the contrast between the rejection of Israel and their future readmission to God's favour. If in casting off the greater portion of His ancient people because of their unbelief God found an occasion of reconciling the world unto Himself, how much greater blessing may be looked for when He shall receive them again as His own! What will that reception be but "*life from the dead?*"

This expression is not to be understood of a moral or spiritual resurrection, for that is already included as a necessary consequence in the reconciliation of the world and the restoration of Israel. Nor is it to be limited, as by Theodoret and other Greek Fathers, to the resurrection of the body. It is a figurative expression which may denote either (1) an increase of spiritual fervour and blessing in the whole Church of Christ on earth, so great and wonderful as to be comparable to a resurrection from the dead; or (2) the new life of the world to come, the final development and glorious consummation of the kingdom of Christ. That blessed state, not only in its first stage,—the resurrection of the body—but in its whole character, as compared with the world that now is, will be a "*life from the dead*." The "*new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*," will spring as it were from the ashes of a dead world into everlasting life.

The former view is the simpler and the more probable, because it does not pass beyond the bounds of the present context.

**16.** "After the Apostle has disclosed his prospect of the glorious results of Israel's conversion, he returns to the grounds for the hope of this conversion itself" (Lange). Rather, St. Paul passes on (δέ) to a further argument for the restoration of the Jews, namely, that it is in accordance with the original consecration of the race.

*For if the first-fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches.*] Rather, "**If, too,** *the first fruit be holy*, **so also is the lump**: *and if the root be holy, so also are the branches*."

The first figure is taken from Num. xv. 19–21, where "*the first of the dough*" is "**the first-fruit of the lump**" (ἀπαρχὴ φυράματος), a portion set aside from the kneading to make a cake for a heave-offering (Neh. x. 37). The first-fruit thus offered to the Lord imparted its consecration to the whole mass which it was taken to represent. In the second figure, instead of a legal ordinance we have a natural process, the branch deriving its properties from the root.

In the interpretation of both figures the fundamental thought is certainly the same, that all Israel has been consecrated to God by the consecration of its "*first-fruit*" and its "*root*." But what are these?

(1) Both figures represent the Patriarchs, especially Abraham. (Chrysostom, and the majority of ancient and modern interpreters.)

(2) "I know no other root that is holy, no holy first-fruit, but our Lord Jesus Christ." (Origen.)

(3) "He calls the Lord Christ according to His human nature 'the first-fruit,' and the patriarch Abraham the root." (Theodoret and others.)

(4) The Jews who formed the Mother Church are "the first-fruit," and "the root" also, as some think.

It is clear that neither Christ nor the Christian Church can be "the root" from which "the natural branches" were broken off: for these branches, the Jews who rejected Christ, never belonged to such a root. The branches being the Jews, the root can only be Abraham and the Patriarchs: compare *v.* 28, and ix. 5.

This interpretation is further confirmed by the fact that St. Paul's figure of the olive tree, with its root and branches, is derived from the Old Testament, where it is applied to the Theocracy or Jewish Church. Of this Jeremiah writes, xi. 16: "*The Lord called thy name, A green olive tree, fair, and of goodly fruit; with the noise of a great tumult* (*i.e.* a



Digitized by Google

be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in [1]among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

18 Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in.

[1] Or, *for them.*

---

thunderstorm) *he hath kindled fire upon it, and the branches of it are broken.*" Of this also Hosea says (xiv. 6): "*His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive tree.*"

The holiness derived from "the Fathers" to their children was not inward moral holiness, but consecration to God by virtue of His choice of Abraham and his seed, declared by the word of promise and confirmed by the covenant of circumcision: compare 1 Cor. vii. 14.

In the first figure of the dough made holy by the offering of its first-fruit, no other kind of holiness can possibly be thought of but this legal and relative holiness of what has been consecrated to God. With so much identity of thought, combined with the parallelism of form, it is impossible to give totally different applications to the two figures, as is done by making the first-fruit Christ or the Christian Church, and Abraham the root. The usual interpretation (1) is alone admissible.

**17–24.** St. Paul carries on the second figure of the root and the branches, because it admits of a distinction between one branch and another, and so can be applied, collectively or individually, to believers and unbelievers, to Jews and also to Gentiles. In his application of the figure to the present position both of Jews and Gentiles, the Apostle finds a warning to the latter against boasting and unbelief (17–22), and a fresh argument for the restoration of the Jews (23, 24).

**17.** *And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree.*] Rather, "**But** *if some of the branches* **were** *broken off, and thou, being a wild* **olive, wast** *graffed in among them,* **and wast made partaker** *of the root and fatness of the olive tree.*" The Church of God being regarded as one and the same in all ages, having Abraham for its root and his children for its "*natural branches,*" it follows that "*some of the branches were broken off,*" when the unbelieving Jews by rejecting Christ ceased to belong to the true people of God. Extending his allegory to the Gentile world, St. Paul compares it to "*a wild olive tree,*" unfruitful in itself, but supplying grafts to be inserted into the good olive tree and enriched by its fatness: such a graft of *wild olive* is the individual reader.

Grafting of the wild shoot on the fruitful stock is the reverse of the common method; and though sometimes practised, it was not intended to fertilise the wild olive, but to give fresh vigour to the fruitful stock, as is clear from Palladius:

> "Fœcundat sterilis pingues oleaster olivas,
> Et quæ non novit munera ferre, docet."

The grafting of the good olive upon the wild is mentioned by Aristotle, 'de Plantis,' I. vi. 4, *Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ἐμφυλλισμὸς ἐν ἄλλοις διαφόροις γένεσιν, ὡς καλλιέλαιος εἰς ἀγριέλαιον.*

St. Paul's words do not correspond exactly to either practice: he seems rather to have shaped his allegory to correspond to the facts which he wished to represent, viz., that the Gentiles had been enriched by admission to the privileges which some of God's ancient people had forfeited through unbelief, *v.* 18. These facts forbid boasting, and rather supply a warning to the Gentiles: and by singling out, as it were, one of his readers and addressing him personally, the Apostle both makes the warning more emphatic, and excludes all boasting against the Jews by reminding the Gentiles that they are not the original Church of Christ, but members adopted into it one by one: "*But if thou* **dost** *boast,* **it is not thou that bearest the root,** *but the root thee.*"

This passage shows that St. Paul recognised as fully as any of the original Apostles the dependence of all Gentile churches upon the one Church of Christ which had grown out of the root of Israel.

**19.** One ground of boasting having been excluded in *v.* 18, another may be sought: "*Thou wilt say then,* **Branches** *were broken off,* **in order that** *I might be graffed in.*"

St. Paul has just said that the rejection of the Jews was, in fact, the enriching of the Gentiles: but it would be arrogant and selfish to assume, as in this supposed reply, that the advantage of the Gentiles was the direct and sole cause of God's casting away any of His people. The selfishness is indicated in the emphatic "*I.*"

The absence of the article before "**branches**" brings out the point, that they who were broken off to make room were original "**branches;**" their *essential character* thus indicated makes the fact that they were broken off more remarkable.

Digitized by Google

20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:

21 For if God spared not the natural branches, *take heed* lest he also spare not thee.

22 Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in *his* goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

23 And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again.

24 For if thou wert cut out of the

---

**20.** *Well;*] A form of partial and often ironical assent: here the fact, and the purpose which it was made to serve, being both admitted, St. Paul goes on to correct a false inference from Israel's rejection by indicating its principal and direct cause: "*Because of* **their** *unbelief they were broken off, and by* **thy** *faith thou standest.*" Their rejection thus viewed in its true cause, namely, "**their** *unbelief,*" gives no occasion for boasting that thou art preferred to them, but is rather a solemn warning to hold fast "**thy** *faith,*" as the condition on which alone "*thou standest*" safe in thy place as a branch on the tree. Therefore "*be not highminded*" because of thy privilege, but rather be the more afraid of falling, as they have fallen.

**21.** Enforcement of the warning: if notwithstanding their greater privilege "*God spared not the natural branches*" when they sinned, much more reason hast thou to fear that He will not spare thee, who art only one of the adopted branches. The reader addressed in the Singular is throughout the representative of the Gentiles.

*take heed lest he also spare not thee.*] Read, "**neither will he spare thee.**" The shorter reading (omitting μήπως) is now generally accepted. The variations may have sprung from a wish to soften the stern note of warning. But even in the reading followed by the A. V. the future indicative points to a real danger: "neither, it is to be feared, will he spare thee."

**22.** *Behold therefore the goodness, &c.*] "*Behold therefore* **goodness and severity in God:** *on them which fell, severity;* **but on thee God's goodness,** *if thou continue in his goodness:* **since** *otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*" The general meaning of the verse is not affected by the slight variations of the text. The way to continue in God's goodness (or in His "*grace,*" Acts xiii. 43) is to "*continue in the faith,*" Col. i. 23, not turning away in unbelief from the mercy bestowed. The Apostle with masterly skill sets both sides of the case at once before his readers, that "**goodness and severity**" seen side by side may stir both love and fear.

**23.** *And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, &c.*] Rather, "**And they moreover if they continue not in their unbelief,**" &c. A new thought is here brought in to check any false presumption based upon the rejection of the Jews. That rejection is not absolute and final: if their unbelief cease, as it may cease, they shall be restored to their former position. Unlikely as such a conversion may seem, it is not impossible: "*for God is able to graff them in again.*" Why does St. Paul thus appeal to the power of God? Various answers are given.

(*a*) To show that the only hindrance is Israel's unbelief, there being no lack of power on God's side. (Grotius.)

(*b*) To meet the difficulty suggested by the figure: "When branches are broken from a tree, they wither and cannot be replaced. Paul therefore here refers to the power of God. What is not done in nature, and cannot be effected by the power of man, will be done by God, with whom all things are possible." (Haldane.)

The former answer is inadequate: St. Paul's custom is to appeal to the power of God only for that which lies beyond the usual course of His providence. See iv. 21, ix. 22, xiv. 4, &c.

The latter answer errs by pressing the figure too far, and so bringing in a thought inconsistent with the context; for in the next verse St. Paul argues that the branches which have been broken off are *more likely* to be restored than the strange shoot to be graffed in.

Quite apart from the figure of the olive tree and its branches, the difficulty of Israel's restoration is the thought that burdens the Apostle's mind throughout this portion of the Epistle; so that, after affirming the possibility of that restoration, it is most natural for him to point to the ground of that possibility in the almighty power which is able not merely to restore Israel, *if* the hindrance of their unbelief is removed, but able also to remove that unbelief itself. The interpretation of the passage does not call for any metaphysical discussion of the relation of God's power to man's free will: for St. Paul passes at once to a simply practical illustration of the Divine power in the conversion of the Gentiles.

**24.** *For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed*

Digitized by Google

olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural *branches*, be graffed into their own olive tree?

25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that [1]blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.

[1] Or, *hardness*.

---

*contrary to nature into a good olive tree:*] Rather, "**For if thou wast cut off from thy native wild olive tree,** *and graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree.*"

"The simple meaning of this verse is that the future restoration of the Jews is *in itself* a more probable event than had been the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church of God. This of course supposes that God regarded the Jews, on account of their relation to Him, with peculiar favour, and that there is still something in their relation to the ancient servants of God and His covenant with them, which causes them to be regarded with special interest." (Hodge.)

**25-27.** The future conversion of Israel having been proved to be both possible and probable, is now shown to be the subject of direct revelation. What follows is thus a confirmation of the hope expressed in *v.* 24: —"*they shall be graffed in*,"—*for I* have something more to make known to you on this subject. The phrase, "*I would not that ye should be ignorant*," addressed, as it always is, by St. Paul to his "*brethren*," indicates (as in i. 13; 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 13) the Apostle's anxiety to draw special attention to some important truth.

The word "mysteries" denotes in classical Greek certain secret religious ceremonies to which only the initiated were admitted. From the ancient traditions and interpretations connected with these ceremonies, and invested with the same secrecy, the word "*mystery*" easily acquired the sense, which it bears in the Septuagint, "a secret." Thus in Dan. ii. 18, 19, &c., it is the "secret" of the king's dream, which none can make known but God, ὁ ἀποκαλύπτων μυστήρια. Compare Job xi. 6; Wisdom ii. 22, "*As for the mysteries of God, they knew them not: neither hoped they for the wages of righteousness, nor discerned a reward for blameless souls.*" In Ecclesiasticus xxii. 22, xxvii. 16, &c., ἀποκαλύπτειν μυστήρια is "*to disclose secrets.*" Bp. Lightfoot (on Col. i. 27) says that "the idea of *secrecy* or *reserve* disappears when μυστήριον is adopted into the Christian vocabulary by St. Paul, and the word signifies simply a truth which was once hidden but now is revealed." But in the Gospels the idea of secrecy or reserve is evidently retained (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10), and the word is applied only to the things of the kingdom of heaven which under the veil of parables were made known to those who were ready to believe, but remained still hidden from the unenlightened.

In a similar sense St. Paul applies the word to "divine secrets," truths unknown till God reveals them (1 Cor. iv. 1; xiii. 2; xiv. 2; xv. 51).

Thus the divine purpose of salvation preached to the Gentile Church at Corinth is called the "*wisdom of God in a mystery*," *i.e.* a divine secret, a truth which none could know till God revealed it (1 Cor. ii. 7, 10).

The meaning of the word in the passage before us is best illustrated by its use in Eph. i. 9, iii. 4, where God's purpose to redeem all nations, and gather together in one all things in Christ, is called "*the mystery of His will*," and "*the mystery of Christ*," because in other ages it was not made known as it was revealed to the Apostles.

The same purpose of redemption *here viewed in its special relation to Israel—i.e.* God's plan of making the obduracy of Israel subservient to the salvation of the Gentiles—is "*this mystery*" revealed to St. Paul, and by him made known to his readers, lest they should attribute it to their own superior wisdom that they had accepted what Israel had refused, and so "*be wise in their own conceits.*" This shows that the "*brethren*" addressed are Gentiles.

*that blindness in part is happened to Israel,*] Rather, "**That hardening has come in part upon Israel.**" Compare above *v.* 7 and Mark iii. 5; Eph. iv. 18. St. Paul joins ἀπὸ μέρους usually with a verb (2 Cor. i. 14, ii. 5; Rom. xv. 15, 24).

The hardening is not *universal*, but only "*in part*," because the "*remnant according to the election of grace*" is not affected by it (*v.* 7): "*some of the branches*" only have been broken off (*v.* 17). Nor is the hardening *final:* it is to continue "*until the fulness of the Gentiles*," (*i.e.* their full number or complement, as of the Jews in *v.* 12) "**shall have come in,**" into that community of the people of God, signified by the good olive tree, into which some of them have been already engrafted. On "*fulness*" (πλήρωμα), see Note on *v.* 12 at the end of the chapter.

The time thus indicated by St. Paul seems to be the same to which our Lord's words point: *Jerusalem shall be trodden down of*

Digitized by Google

26 And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, [g] There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:

[g] Is. 59. 20.

27 For this *is* my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.

28 As concerning the gospel, *they*

---

*the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled* (Luke xxi. 24).

**26.** *And so all Israel shall be saved:*] The A. V. rightly makes this the beginning of a new sentence, thereby giving greater prominence to a distinct and important prophecy. "*And so*" refers to the preceding sentence marking the coming in of the Gentiles as the condition upon which will follow the salvation of Israel.

As the antithesis of "*the Gentiles*" and "*Israel*" forbids us to interpret the latter of a spiritual Israel ("*the Israel of God*," Gal. vi.) including "*the whole people* of God" (Calvin), so the expression "ALL *Israel*" being quite unlimited must neither be narrowed down to "*the remnant according to election of grace*" (*v.* 7), by which the Apostle means the believing Jews of his own day, nor to "*the many thousands of Jews which believe*" mentioned in Acts xxi. 20, nor to the whole number of those who shall individually from time to time, even unto the end of the world, be turned to the Lord (Melanchthon). Neither on the other hand must the universality of the expression be exaggerated so as to mean the whole nation *without any individual exception*. The words must be taken in their natural unexaggerated sense as in 1 Kings xii. 1, 2 Chr. xii. 1; Dan. ix. 11; thus foretelling a future conversion of the Jews, so universal that the separation into an "*elect remnant*" and "*the rest who were hardened*" shall disappear, and the whole nation "*shall be saved*," *i.e.* be made partakers through faith in Jesus Christ of the long-promised salvation.

The passage in this its natural interpretation has no reference to the conclusions which some have sought to draw from it (1), that all men shall at last be saved eternally, and (2) that the Jewish Theocracy with its Temple, Priesthood, and earthly kingdom shall be re-established in Jerusalem. "Israel does not take in the Church, but the Church takes in Israel" (Meyer).

*as it is written,*] It is very possible that study of ancient prophecies may have been one mode in which St. Paul, like Daniel (ix. 2, 21, 22), was prepared to receive a revelation of the future destiny of Israel. We must not, however, suppose that he here quotes Is. lix. 20, 21, as the *source* of his own prediction, but only as a *confirmation* of the latter part of it, "*all Israel shall be saved*." The mystery which had been revealed to him by the Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 10) he perceives to have been indicated long before in the words of Isaiah, "There shall come *a Redeemer* (Goël) *for Zion*, and for them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord" (Hebrew literally rendered): LXX, "There shall come for Zion a Redeemer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." St. Paul, quoting the LXX from memory, substitutes "*from Zion*," led to it probably by reminiscences of such passages as Pss. xiv. 7, l. 2, liii. 7, cx. 2; Is. ii. 3, Mic. iv. 2. The undesigned variation, "*from Zion*," serves to show that the Apostle is thinking not of the Second Advent which must follow the Conversion of Israel, but of that first Advent in which Christ as revealed in the Gospel is still going forth from Jerusalem, and shall yet go forth in special power to redeem His people Israel. That full restoration of Israel will be for the whole world the beginning of a "*life from the dead*" (*v.* 15).

*and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:*] St. Paul follows the LXX, who give the general sense with sufficient correctness for his purpose; the more literal rendering (see note on Is. 59, 23) "**and for them that turn from transgression in Jacob**," points at least as clearly to that unbelieving portion of the nation whose conversion will fulfil the prophecy that "*all Israel shall be saved*."

As this portion of the quotation describes the redeeming and converting work of Christ, so *v.* 27 shows God's forgiveness as the ground of the New Covenant.

**27.** *For this is my covenant unto them,*] A renewal of God's word to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 4) applied by Isaiah (lix. 21) to the new covenant, which he proceeds to describe: "*My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*"

The expression "*thy seed's seed*" seems to show that the promise is addressed to Israel, which having been hitherto partly faithful and partly unfaithful, has now returned to its fidelity.

For this description of the covenant St. Paul substitutes another taken from Is. xxvii. 9 (Septuag.) καὶ τοῦτο ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ, "And this is his blessing, when I shall have taken away his sin," which is more appropriate to his

Digitized by Google

*are* enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, *they are* beloved for the fathers' sakes.

29 For the gifts and calling of God *are* without repentance.

30 For as ye in times past have not [1]believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief:

31 Even so have these also now

[1] Or, *obeyed.*

---

present purpose as containing a promise that the sins of Israel shall be taken away.

See notes on Is. xxvii. 9, and compare Jer. xxxi. 31–34.

The fulfilment of St. Paul's prediction must be regarded as still future, being the last step in the universal diffusion of Christianity, and the prelude to Christ's second coming (Meyer).

**28–32.** The present alienation of Israel in contrast with God's unchanging promise to their fathers (28, 29) is part of the method by which He will extend His mercy to all nations, and so at last include both Jew and Gentile in one common salvation (30–32).

**28.** *As concerning the gospel, they are enemies*] *i.e.* enemies of God, treated by Him as enemies and shut out for a time from His mercy: and this is "*for your sakes,*" that you may receive that mercy from which they for their disobedience have been excluded. This passive sense of "*enemies,*" *i.e.* hated by God, is necessary as answering to "*beloved*" in the parallel clause. In what sense God hates the sinner, see in the note on v. 10.

*but as touching the election,*] Meyer, following Ewald, argues that "*the election*" having been defined in *vv.* 5–7 as "*the remnant according to* **election** *of grace*" must retain that meaning here: "but in regard to the election, that chosen remnant is a living witness that Israel is still beloved of God."

This concrete sense of "*the election*" is, however, found only in *v.* 7, where it is explained by the context: and the usual interpretation, "as concerning God's choice of Israel to be his people"—answers better to the previous clause "*as concerning the gospel.*" The meaning then is, "If we look at the Divine election of Israel, wherein God chose not a mere remnant, but the people at large, they are still "*beloved for the fathers' sakes,*" because from them the promised blessing was transmitted to their children according to the form of the covenant—"*to thee and to thy seed*" (Calvin): compare Luke i. 54, 55.

**29.** The last thought is now confirmed by "an axiom truly apostolic" (Bengel) concerning the unchangeable nature of God's purpose. His acts of grace, His gifts or favours freely granted (χαρίσματα), and especially His calling, are "*without repentance.*" The word thus happily rendered means either "that is not repented of" (Plato, Legg. ix. 866, E.) or, "that cannot be repented of" (Polyb. xxiv. 12, 11): compare 2 Cor. vii. 10.

Godet interprets "*the gifts of God*" of *the moral and intellectual qualities* with which Israel was specially endowed for its peculiar mission to the world: but his argument that the word (χαρίσματα) "usually has this sense in St. Paul's Epistles" is not well founded, and his interpretation itself is fanciful: see note on χάρισμα, i. 10.

**30–32.** The general truth alleged in *v.* 29 is corroborated by an explanation of the manner in which it will be realised in this particular instance.

The course of God's Providence towards Gentiles and Jews is summed up in a series of comparisons and contrasts, which are made more striking by close and continued parallelisms, the antithesis "*disobedience — mercy*" being thrice repeated in the three verses 30–32 (Forbes).

**30.** *For as ye in times past have not believed God, &c.*] Rather, "*For as ye in times past* **obeyed not** *God, yet have now obtained mercy* **by their disobedience,** *even so have these also now* **been disobedient, that by the mercy bestowed on you they may also themselves** *obtain mercy.*"

The former disobedience of the Gentiles (i. 18 ff.) ought to repress all uncharitable feelings in regard to the present disobedience of the Jews, more especially as their disobedience has been made the occasion of God's mercy to the Gentiles.

The Apostle describes in *v.* 30 the *past* and *present* relations of Gentile and Jew, and compares them in *v.* 31 with their *present* and *future* relations.

The comparison involves also a difference, for while in each case "*disobedience*" is overcome by "*mercy*" there is a direct contrast in the means employed: "*mercy*" to the Gentiles results from "*disobedience*" in the Jews, "*mercy*" to the Jews is to be the result of "*mercy*" already bestowed upon the Gentiles: compare xv. 9. The order of the words in the Greek (for which compare 2 Cor. xii. 7) admits, but does not require, a different construction of *v.* 31: "Even so have these also now been disobedient, because of the mercy bestowed on you." But the parallel clauses are in this way less perfectly balanced than in the order of A.V. retained above.

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, obeyed.

[2] Or, shut them all up together.

not [1]believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy.

32 For God hath [2]concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.

33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable *are* his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

34 [h]For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?

[h] Is. 40. 13. Wisd. 9. 13. 1 Cor. 2. 16.

---

**32.** *For God hath concluded them all in unbelief,*] Rather, "**For God shut** *them all* **up to disobedience.**" The final proof that God will have mercy on Israel is that this is in accordance with and part of the universal plan of His salvation. By "*them all*" the Apostle denotes all of whom he has been speaking, *i.e.* both Jews and Gentiles in the same natural and unexaggerated sense in which he spoke of "*all Israel*" in *v.* 26. Doctrinal motives for unduly limiting or extending the application are excluded by the consideration "that the universality of the Divine *purpose* of redemption (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 4), and the sufficiency of the redemption actually wrought for the justification of all (v. 18), do not exclude its partial non-realisation at last through the fault of the individuals concerned" (Meyer).

The meaning of the phrase "*concluded*" or "**shut up to disobedience**" is best seen in the passages where the Septuagint has the same Greek verb: Ps. xxxi. 8, "*And hast not shut me up into the hand of the enemy,*" Ps. lxxviii. 50, "*but gave their life* (LXX, 'cattle') *over to the pestilence.*" Ib. *v.* 62, "*He gave his people over also unto the sword.*"

In accordance with these passages, and with St. Paul's own usage (Gal. iii. 22), God is represented as giving over all men, both Jews and Gentiles, to disobedience, without power of escape: a bold and striking declaration of God's all-ruling Providence, forcing even sin into the service of His mercy.

There are various modes of softening the expression: *e.g.* that of Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers, that God convicted them all of disobedience; and that of Diodorus in the Catena, that God did not cause the disobedience, but only permitted it through the exercise of man's free will. But St. Paul's language means more than this: God's Providence places man in such circumstances that the perversity of his will shows itself in actual disobedience. This has been fully proved in regard to the Heathen in i. 24, 26, 28, and in regard to those who were under the law in ch. ii. and ch. vii. "We ought to add that in both cases the latent sin had manifested itself freely and actively, before taking the form of a judgment from God" (Godet).

Instead therefore of trying to weaken the real force of the Apostle's language, it is far better to fix our thoughts on the glorious vindication of God's severity which is shown in the gracious purpose that it is intended to serve.

*that he might have mercy upon all.*] Rather, "*upon* **them all,**" meaning, as in the former clause, the definite whole (τοὺς πάντας) made up of "*the fulness of the Gentiles*" and "*all Israel;*" see note at the end. To "*have mercy*" means to make them partakers of that "*common salvation*" (Jude 3), which is emphatically a dispensation of mercy, as is shown in *vv.* 30, 31.

"God by His ineffable wisdom so disposes and controls the affairs of men, that there is no part of mankind that is not involved in sin; not that He is the cause of sin in any, but that for a time He suffers men to fall by their own sinfulness, in order that when they have discovered their error they may feel that they have been saved, not by their own merit, but by the free mercy of God, that they may not grow arrogant. And in the meantime, while doing this, He is so far from suggesting evil to any one, that by His goodness He marvellously turns the evils of others to our good. But perhaps we are entering too deep into the recesses of this mystery, for a man speaking to men.

"Amazement comes over me as I contemplate the ineffable method of God's counsel; and since I cannot explain it, I would fain exclaim, O the depth of His superabounding wisdom!" (Erasmus.)

**33–36.** The glorious truth declared in *v.* 32 forces from the Apostle's heart an exclamation of adoring wonder, which forms a noble conclusion to the great argument of the Epistle. The wrath "*revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness*" (i. 18), has given place to the mercy which embraces all the nations of the earth.

**33.** *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!*] Rather, "*O the depth of the riches* **and** *wisdom and knowledge of God.*" This construction, adopted by Origen, Chrysostom, and other Greek Fathers, is commended by its greater simplicity, and by the fact that, after quoting, in *v.* 34, a passage from Isaiah (xl. 13) which illustrates God's *wisdom and knowledge*, St. Paul adds, in *v.* 35, a passage from Job (xli. 11) which refers to the *riches* of God.

"*Depth*" is frequently found in the Greek classics as an attribute of "*riches*" (Soph.

Digitized by Google

35 Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?

36 For of him, and through him, and to him, *are* all things: to whom *be* glory for ever. Amen.

---

'Ajax,' 130), and also of "*wisdom*" and "*knowledge*" (Æschylus, 'Sept. c. Theb.' 578; Pindar, 'Nem.,' iv. 7; Plato, 'Theæt.' p. 183, E.). As applied to the latter words here, it denotes not "unfathomable mystery," but only "inexhaustible fulness."

The true distinction between "*knowledge*" and "*wisdom*" is briefly indicated by Theodoret: "He foreknew these things from the beginning, and having foreknown them, He arranged (ᾠκονόμησε) them wisely." Bp. Lightfoot remarks on Col. ii. 3: "While γνῶσις is simply *intuitive*, σοφία is *ratiocinative* also. While γνῶσις applies chiefly to the apprehension of truths, σοφία superadds the power of reasoning about them and tracing their relations." To complete the distinction, we must add that while "knowledge" is *theoretical*, "wisdom" is *practical*, and while "knowledge" is purely *intellectual*, "wisdom" is also *moral*, and for that reason is both the most perfect of mental gifts (Aristotle, 'Nic. Eth.' vi. 10) and the queen of all virtues (Cicero, 'de Off.' i. 43). In the present context γνῶσις seems to refer especially to God's foreknowledge of the free determinations of man's will, both in individuals and in nations: while σοφία denotes the admirable skill with which He includes man's free actions in His plan, and transforms them into so many means for the accomplishment of His good purpose (Godet).

*how unsearchable are his judgments,*] According to Meyer God's "*judgments*" are the determinate purposes which His "*wisdom*" sets before Him, and for the attainment of which His "power" is exerted. "*His ways*" are the particular courses which His "*knowledge*" discerns to be the best in which His "*power*" can work.

Tholuck reverses this view: the "*judgments*" are the decisions of the Divine *knowledge*, and the "*ways*" are the methods which God's *wisdom* adopts for realising those decisions.

It seems simpler and truer to say that *knowledge* and *wisdom* are combined both in forming the *judgments*, and choosing the *ways* to accomplish them.

To man's natural reason these "*judgments*" of God are unsearchable *as the great deep* (Ps. xxxvi. 6; compare Job xi. 7), and "*His ways past finding out*" (Job ix. 10; compare Eccles. viii. 16, 17: "*because though a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea farther; though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it.*")

In the contemplation of "*judgments*" and "*ways*," which thus pass man's understanding, the Apostle is forced to exclaim, "*O the depth of . . . the wisdom and knowledge of God!*"

St. Augustine often uses this passage as if it were equivalent to ix. 20, "*Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God.*" He thus silences all objection to his own predestinarian doctrines, such as that of the damnation of infants dying unbaptized: Sermon 294, § 7: compare Serm. 15, § 3, and 27, § 7. But this passage is not a denunciation of presumptuous objections against the wisdom and goodness of God's *hidden* ways: it is an outburst of wonder and delight in contemplating a glorious *revelation* of wisdom and goodness surpassing all that the heart of man could have conceived.

**34, 35.** St. Paul now justifies the wondering exclamations of *v.* 33 by passages of the Old Testament which illustrate the knowledge and wisdom and riches of God, the order of the three ideas in *v.* 33 being here inverted, as is very usual, so as to bring the last thought into immediate connexion with its own illustration.

**34.** *who hath known the mind of the Lord?*] The A.V.—"*Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord*"—is closer to the Hebrew. See note on Is. xl. 13. But the Septuagint, which St. Paul follows, sufficiently preserves the general thought that the Divine intelligence is incomprehensible and immeasurable to man. See 1 Cor. ii. 16, and compare Judith viii. 13, 14; Wisdom, ix. 17.

"O the depth of the knowledge of God!" For who can measure the mind (νοῦν) which is the organ of that knowledge (γνώσεως).

*or who hath been his counsellor?*] Is not His wisdom all His own, admitting no aid nor counsel from beings of inferior faculties?

**35.** *Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?*] See note on Job xli. 11. The Septuagint is here quite erroneous, and St. Paul setting it aside gives the sense of the Hebrew correctly but freely: "**Or who hath first given to him, and shall be repaid again?**" Herein is shown "*the depth of the riches of God,*" that no gift of His is a requital of benefits first conferred on Him, but all are of His own free grace and overflowing bounty. The Apostle here once more touches the root of Jewish error, the self-righteous notion of earning God's favour by previous merit.

**36.** The reason why none can make God his debtor is that all things are "*from*

Digitized by Google

*him*" as their first cause (1 Cor. viii. 6) and "*through him*" as the ever present agent who still "*worketh all in all*" (1 Cor. xii. 6; Heb. ii. 10), and "**unto** *him*," as their final cause in whom all reach the end and perfection of their being.

Of these three clauses the first and second might be referred to the Father and the Son respectively, but the third "**unto** *him*" cannot possibly refer to the Spirit as a distinct Person. We must understand all three of God the Father, or rather of the whole Godhead, as in *v.* 33.

The Doxology then follows as a noble conclusion to St. Paul's great argument; it stands in simple grandeur, like one of the Patriarch's pillars (Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxv. 11) set up in remembrance of some special revelation of the goodness and majesty of God.

*to whom, &c.*] "**To him be the glory for ever. Amen.**"

"As the rivers return again to the place whence they came, they all come from the sea, and they all run into the sea again: so all our store as it issued at first from the fountain of His grace, so should it fall at last into the ocean of His glory" (Bp. Sanderson, Serm. on Rom. xv. 6).

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 7, 9, 12, 13, 32.

**7.** *ἐπωρώθησαν.* The Verb is used only once in the LXX, Job xvii. 7, *πεπώρωνται οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου*, where the Hebrew is כָּהָה "to be feeble" or "dim," as a lamp.

The real root *πῶρος* was the name of a stone used for statuary (Ammonius, Valckn. Animadv. p. 169). It was also applied to "callus": Aristot. Hist. Anim. III. xix. 9, *Σηπόμενον δὲ γίνεται τὸ αἷμα ἐν τῷ σώματι πύον, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πύου πῶρος.* Hence *πωρόω* and *πώρωσις* were used by medical writers, *e.g.* Dioscorides, to describe the formation of callus in the re-union of broken bones; see Liddell and Scott. The Adjective *πωρός* appears to be an invention of the grammarians (Fritzsche).

**9.** The Hebrew means literally: "Be their table before them for a snare, and to them at ease for a trap."

The LXX render *Γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον.*

St. Paul, quoting freely from memory, for *ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν* puts *αὐτοῖς* at the end, inserts *καὶ εἰς θήραν*, and changes the order of the two last clauses, reading *καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς.*

**12.** *ἥττημα.* The word is found once in the LXX, Is. xxxi. 8, *οἱ δὲ νεανίσκοι ἔσονται εἰς ἥττημα*, and in 1 Cor. vi. 7, *ὅλως ἥττημα.* In Isaiah the Heb. לָמַס is rendered by Fürst, Ewald, Delitzsch, Gesenius, &c., "for tribute," which is its usual meaning: the LXX (followed by A. V. *discomfited*), render it in this one passage as if it were derived from מָסַס "to melt away:" though this interpretation may be incorrect, the sense in which they used *ἥττημα* is obviously that of *the loss and diminution which an army sustains by defeat.*

That St. Paul here uses the word (*ἥττημα*) as meaning "diminution," is clear from the antithesis to *πλήρωμα*, which means the "complement," or full number. See Bp. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 323, who shows that in this passage *πλήρωμα* has its usual meaning 'the full number,' 'the whole body' (whether the whole absolutely, or the whole relatively to God's purpose), of whom only a part had been hitherto gathered into the Church.

**13.** *γάρ* DFGL 17, 37 Vul., Goth., Pp. gr. et lat.

*δέ* A B ℵ P 47, Cop., Syr. utr., Memph., Arm., Theodoret (some MSS), Damasc., Lachm., Treg., Tisch. 8, Meyer, who remarks, "With such divided testimony, *δέ* is the best supported, and to be preferred; it came to be glossed by more definite particles."

Ib. *μὲν οὖν* Lachm., Tisch. and (doubtfully) Tregelles, with preponderance of external authority.

**32.** *τοὺς πάντας.* This expression has, of course, the same meaning and extent in both clauses. Meyer supposes it to denote all Jews and Gentiles not only "in the gross" but "*jointly* and *severally*," so as to include "each single member of the collective whole." This however is precisely what would have been expressed by *πάντας*, without the Article: whereas *τοὺς πάντας* is used "with pointed reference to *the whole viewed in the mass*" (Rev. T. S. Green, 'Grammar of New Testament Dialect,' iv. § 4).

Some interpret the passage of *the final salvation of all men*: but in accordance with the meaning of "*mercy*" in *vv.* 30, 31, to "*have mercy upon* **them all**" can only mean to bring them all, Jews as well as Gentiles, into the Church of Christ on earth: "One thing only St. Paul here teaches: it is that at the close of the history of mankind upon this earth there will be an economy of grace in which salvation shall be extended to all the nations living here below, and that this magnificent result will be the effect of the humbling dispensations through which the two portions of humanity, Jews and Gentiles, shall successively have passed" (Godet).

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XII.

1 *God's mercies must move us to please God.* 3 *No man must think too well of himself,* 6 *but attend every one on that calling wherein he is placed.* 9 *Love, and many other duties, are required of us.* 19 *Revenge is specially forbidden.*

I BESEECH you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living

---

### CHAP. XII.—HOLY LIVING.

St. Paul now passes from the main argument of the Epistle to practical exhortations based upon the preceding doctrines.

Melanchthon thought that in the following chapters Christian duties are classified in a formal scheme, as *moral* (xii.), *political* (xiii.), and *ecclesiastical* (xiv.-xv. 12).

But the Apostle's thoughts seem rather to flow on in a natural order, of which the general course can easily be traced. He begins by requiring personal consecration to God's service (xii. 1, 2), and from this inmost centre of the spiritual life he follows out its manifold development in Christian graces (xii. 3–21) and civil duties (xiii. 1-10), enforcing his exhortations by the prospect of the coming day of the Lord (xiii. 11–14).

"It will be observed how comprehensively he surveys the whole range of human action and conduct. He starts from the consideration of men as constituting 'many members in one body,' and he proceeds to direct them in their various offices. He passes in review the private and public duties to which they might be called—ministering, teaching, exhorting, giving, ruling and obeying; he depicts the spirit of the Christian in business and in rest, in joy and in sorrow, in hope and in tribulation, towards friends and towards enemies, in peace and in wrath: and he lays down the Christian principles of civil government and civil obedience. It is a picture of life in its length and breadth, and even in all its lights and shadows, transfigured, as the landscape by the sun, under the renovating influence of those spiritual rays of love which illuminated and warmed the Apostle's soul" (Wace, 'Christianity and Morality,' p. 147).

**1, 2.** THE LIVING SACRIFICE. The Apostle begins with tender entreaty, and in the fulness of divine grace just unfolded finds the strongest motive by which he can "*beseech*" his "*bretbren*" to consecrate both body (*v.* 1) and mind (*v.* 2) to a holy obedience: compare 2 Cor. x. 1.

The word "*therefore*" connects this chapter *immediately* with the last, as in Eph. iv. 1, where the course of thought and mode of transition are very similar. But it is equally true that the Apostle bases his exhortation to holiness upon the doctrines of grace set forth at large in the whole preceding argument of the Epistle, which culminates in the declaration of God's all-embracing mercy in xi. 32.

*by the mercies of God,*] The mercy (ἔλεος) so often spoken of in ch. xi., as embracing both Jew and Gentile in a common salvation, is here described by a stronger word in the plural number, expressing the tenderest compassion as shown in manifold forms (οἰκτιρμῶν), a word very frequent in the LXX (2 Sam. xxiv. 11; Ps. li. 1; Neh. ix. 19, 27, 28, 31).

*present*] παραστῆσαι, a proper term for bringing an offering to the Lord (Lev. xvi. 7; Luke ii. 22; Col. i. 22, 28).

*your bodies*] The body is claimed first for God's service, because there was great need to warn new converts from heathenism against sins of the flesh: compare 1 Thess. iv. 3. That the Roman Christians had need of such exhortation, is clear from vi. 12, 13, 19).

*a living sacrifice,*] The sanctification of the outward part of man, which is a true sacrifice, is beautifully represented under the symbols of sacrificial worship. The language is most appropriate; for the sincere worshipper, whether Gentile or Jew, saw in the sacrifice which he presented on the altar a symbol of his own self-devotion. This symbolic purpose determined the choice of the proper material for an altar-sacrifice: it must represent the offerer's *life*.

For this reason, in all the chief sacrifices it must be itself a *living* creature: and in every case, without exception, it must be the offerer's own lawful property, the fruit of his *life work*, and also fit, as food, for *the support of his life*. In presenting such a sacrifice the worshipper was presenting *a portion of his own life* as a symbol of the whole. Compare Kurtz, 'Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament," p. 60, &c.

This idea of the devotion of the offerer's life was most strikingly embodied in the continual Burnt-offering (Ex. xxix. 38–42; Num. xxviii. 3), the flesh of which was all given over to the sacred fire of the altar, and thence ascended in its purified essence as a sweet-smelling savour to Jehovah: so must the Christian offer his body to the inward refining fire of the Holy Ghost, that it may be made a sacrifice acceptable to God (Kurtz, p. 162).

But how "*a living sacrifice*"? The sanctified body might be called "*a living sacrifice,*"

Digitized by Google

sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, *which is* your reasonable service.

2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

---

because its natural life is not consumed in the offering like that of an ordinary sacrifice. But that St. Paul has a deeper meaning is proved by the parallel passage, vi. 13, "**present** (παραστήσατε, A.V. '*yield*') *yourselves unto God as alive from the dead.*" There is in every sacrifice a death, and in this sacrifice a death unto sin, out of which there arises a new life of righteousness unto God. Thus the "*living sacrifice*" is that in which, though the natural life is not lost, a new life of holiness is gained: compare vi. 13.

The fire of this offering, as Chrysostom says, "needs no wood or fuel laid beneath, but lives of itself, and does not burn up the sacrifice, but rather gives it life."

This consecration of the body is preparatory to its final redemption.

*acceptable unto God,*] Literally, "well pleasing to God": compare Wisdom iv. 10; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20.

*which is your reasonable service.*] An apposition to the sentence "*present your bodies a living sacrifice.*"

The sanctification of the body, though in the truest sense a sacrifice, is not, like the symbolical sacrifice, an outward act of religious worship (λατρεία): the self-dedication is an act of the mind or reason (λόγος), and in this sense "*a reasonable service.*"

St. Pual thus teaches his readers, who might miss the external pomp of Pagan or Jewish sacrificial worship, that they had gained something far better by becoming Christians. "*Your* worship," he means, "is of a higher order, the worship of your reason: each of you for himself can now present a sacrifice in the highest sense "holy, acceptable to God"; each can be himself a priest serving God with a spiritual worship.

In 'The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,' p. 547, the angels are said to offer "an unbloody and reasonable (λογικὴν) offering."

2. Sanctification must extend to man's whole nature, and include both separation from all that is unholy, and an inward change in the man himself.

*be not conformed to this world:*] Or, 'fashion not yourselves like unto this world' (Tyndale).

The Jews distinguished the times before and after the expected coming of their Messiah as "*this world* (αἰών, age)," and "*the world to come.*"

Our Lord Himself and His disciples applied the same names to the times before and after his Second Advent, including the persons and the general state of things proper to "*this world*" and "*the world to come.*" "*The prince of this world*" is Satan, and "*the children of this world*" are the wicked: "*to deliver us from this present wicked world*" (Gal. i. 4) was the purpose of Christ's death. The Christian therefore must not in his daily life (mark the Present Tenses) be of the same fashion συσχηματίζεσθε) with "*this world,*" as he was formerly when living "*after the flesh*" (viii. 12): but on the contrary he must be undergoing a thorough transformation (μεταμορφοῦσθε) by the renewing of his mind, which ceases to be "*the mind of the flesh*" (Col. ii. 18), and under the influence of the Holy Ghost (Tit. iii. 5) is renewed day by day (2 Cor. iv. 16) "*unto knowledge*" (Col. iii. 10).

This work of God's Spirit does not exclude the co-operation of man's will, which is presupposed in the exhortation "*be ye transformed.*" On the difference between σχῆμα, the fleeting figure or *fashion*, and μορφή, the essential organic *form*, see notes on ii. 20, 1 Pet. i. 14, and 1 Cor. vii. 31 ("*the fashion of this world passeth away*"), and Bp. Lightfoot's Dissertation on Phil. ii. 6, 7.

*that ye may prove*] The unrenewed mind cannot "*prove what is the will of God,*" *i.e.* assay (δοκιμάζειν) or discern by practical experience what God wills (Eph. v. 10): to do this is the end for which St. Paul would have his readers transformed by the renewal of the mind.

*that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.*] Read, **the** *good*, &c. It has been proposed to render the passage as follows: "the will of God, namely that which is good, and well pleasing, and perfect." But this construction is, at least, uncommon in the N. T.

The objections urged against the A. V. are

(1) That the expression "*acceptable will of God*" is unintelligible, (2) that it is mere tautology.

(1) What, it is asked, is the meaning of "*acceptable*" as applied to "*the will*"? To whom is the will acceptable?

The answer is that "the will" (τὸ θέλημα) means not the faculty, as the objection implies, but its object, what God wills: and this object is "*acceptable*" or well-pleasing (εὐάρεστον) to God who wills it. There is

Digitized by Google

3 For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think [1]soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.

4 For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office:

5 So we, *being* many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

6 Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, *let us pro-*

[1] Gr. *to sobriety.*

---

an evident reference to the words in *v.* 1, "*a sacrifice acceptable unto God.*" The same word (εὐάρεστον) is used in Wisdom ix. 10 ("*that I may know what is pleasing unto thee*").

(2) It would be tautology to state as a general abstract proposition that what God wills is acceptable or well-pleasing to Him: but St. Paul is speaking of a particular object of God's will, the sanctification of His people (1 Thess. iv. 3); and this the Apostle describes, with an emphatic accumulation and climax of epithets as "good, and acceptable, and perfect."

### 3–21. Christian Graces.

The general idea of consecration to God's service is now carried out into particular duties, beginning with *the right exercise of special gifts in the Church* (*vv.* 3–8): the first place is here given to humility or sober-mindedness as essential to Christian unity.

**3.** *For I say, through the grace given unto me,*] The close connexion with *vv.* 1, 2, indicated in the word "*for,*" lies in the thought that humility is the immediate effect of self-surrender to God.

St. Paul speaks with authority *through the grace given unto him*, to make him the Apostle of the Gentiles (i. 5).

*to every man that is among you,*] The sense of these emphatic words must be sought in the context, which shows that the Apostle's precept is expressly meant to include, in its universality, those whose special spiritual gifts had gained for them influence or office in the Church at Rome (compare *v.* 6). St. Paul, it seems, either knew that there had been, or feared that there might be the same spiritual presumption at Rome as at Corinth, whence he was writing.

*not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think;*] The play on words in the Greek has a force which can hardly be imitated: "**not to be high minded above a right mind, but to be of a mind to be sober minded,** *according as God hath dealt to* **each** *a* **measure** *of faith.*"

The last clause fixes the standard by which a man who has "**a mind to be sober minded**" must judge of himself. We learn from it that faith is a gift of God, given in different measures, according to the capacity of each man's nature and the work to which God calls him, and that, as the receptive faculty, faith regulates and measures all the powers of the spiritual man. "In proportion as the faith of individuals is more or less living, practical, active, operative in this or that direction, contemplative, or entering into outward life in oratory, action, and so forth, they have to measure accordingly the position and task that befit them in the Church" (Meyer). The emphatic position of ἑκάστῳ, gives prominence to the idea of diversity between one man and another: 1 Cor. iii. 5; vii. 17.

**4, 5.** *For as we have many members in one body, &c.*] Translate: "**For just as in one body** *we have many members*, **and the members have not all** *the same office:* **So are we the many** *one body in Christ*, **and severally** *members one of another.*"

The reason why each must judge of himself according to the measure of faith dealt to him by God, is that the Church, like our own body, consists of many members having different functions to perform.

As the many members are one body in the man, so the multitude of believers "*are one body in Christ.*" Thus Christ is here presented not as the head to which the other members are subject (as in Eph. i. 22; iv. 15, &c.), but as the living Person uniting and animating the whole body: compare 1 Cor. xii. 12.

From this unity of the whole follows the mutual dependence of the parts: belonging all to one body, they severally belong one to another. This thought, not expressed in *v.* 4, is added in the application of the figure, to enforce the duty of believers to work together, each in his proper sphere, for the common welfare of the Church. Compare Eph. iv. 25.

**6–8.** The thought that "**the members have not all** *the same office*" is now applied in detail to the Church.

The construction of the sentence is a little obscured by extreme brevity, but the meaning is rightly brought out in the A. V.

Digitized by Google

*phesy* according to the proportion of faith;

7 Or ministry, *let us wait* on *our* ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching;

8 Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that [1]giveth, *let him do it* [1]with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

[1] Or, *imparteth.* [1] Or, *liberally.*

---

The "*gifts*" (cf. v. 15) vary as the grace of God, of which they are effects, is manifold (1 Pet. iv. 10). They are special qualities and powers imparted by the One Spirit, who also directs the diversity of their operations to one end. "Most frequently it is a natural talent that the Spirit of God appropriates, increasing its power and sanctifying its use" (Godet).

The first four gifts here named are connected with special offices.

Prophecy in the Christian Church was a gift whereby the mind, enlightened and exalted by the Spirit of revelation, was able to declare the purposes of God, and to foretell future events (Acts xi. 28; xx. 23; xxi. 4, 11), as well as to unfold the deep mysteries of the Christian faith, and clothe its moral precepts in words of wisdom and power not of man's teaching. The prophets were esteemed next in dignity to the Apostles. (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iii. 5; iv. 11.)

St. Paul prescribes that the prophets should exercise their gift "*according to the proportion* **of their faith**:" these words evidently refer to *v.* 3, and mean that the prophets should utter neither more nor less than the revelation received by their *measure of faith*, without exaggeration, display, or self-seeking.

"The rule of faith," "the general analogy of revealed truth," and all similar renderings which make "*faith*" mean that which is to be believed, are unsuited to the context and otherwise untenable.

**7.** *ministry*,] The word διακονία, meaning "active service," has wide and varied applications. It often includes all ministration or office in the Christian Church (Acts i. 17, 25; xx. 24; xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 8, 9; iv. 1; v. 18; vi. 3; xi. 8; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 3, 11). But as "*there are differences of administrations*" (1 Cor. xii. 5) the word is also applied in more limited senses, as for example, to "the ministration of the word" (Acts vi. 4), and very frequently to the ministration of alms (Acts vi. 1; xi. 29; xii. 25; Rom. xv. 31; 1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 1, 12, 13.

Since in this passage St. Paul is speaking of various special gifts, and distinguishes "*ministry*" from prophecy, teaching, and exhortation, the word must be taken in a limited sense, as service in things temporal and external, such as the wants of the poor, the sick, and the stranger.

As in Acts vi. men "*full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom*" are to be set over "*the daily ministration*" of alms, so here "*ministry*" or "diaconate" is a "*gift*."

Compare 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12, and 1 Pet. iv. 11, which latter passage is very like this in sense and construction.

*let us wait on our ministering:*] This is a fair paraphrase and completion of the sense; the words in the Greek are simply "in the ministry," meaning 'Let us keep within our proper ministry, and be wholly occupied therein.' Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 15, "*give thyself wholly to them*" (ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι).

*or he that teacheth,*] The teacher's gift lies in an enlightened understanding and a faculty of clear exposition: he uses "*the word of wisdom*" or "*the word of knowledge*" to arrange, develope, and enforce truths previously revealed. In 1 Cor. xii. 28, he is ranked next after apostles and prophets.

**8.** *or he that exhorteth,*] "*Teaching* addresses itself to the understanding, *exhortation* to the heart and will" (Philippi). "*Exhortation*" was especially used in the early Church as in the Synagogue (Luke iv. 20; Acts xiii. 15; Justin Martyr 'Apol.' i. c. 87) to impress the lessons of Scripture upon the conscience, will, and affections.

The possessor of this, or either of the preceding gifts, is bidden to occupy himself in the province thus marked out for him, and be content therewith.

*he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity;*] From gifts that qualify for special offices in the Church St. Paul passes to others of a more general nature.

The first, almsgiving (Eph. iv. 28; 1 Tim. vi. 18), is to be practised "*in simplicity*" or singleness of heart, without ostentation or any selfish aim (Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22).

"Liberality," though not expressed in the word (ἁπλότητι), is essentially connected with this single-mindedness. It need not seem strange that a gift of the Spirit is required for the right use of riches, if we remember our Lord's teaching (Matt. vi. 3; xix. 21).

*he that ruleth,*] Literally, "he that presideth" (ὁ προϊστάμενος). A similar title (ὁ προεστώς) is used by Justin Martyr, 'Apologia' I. 65, 67, to denote the minister who presided at the celebration of the Eucharist. In the N. T. this special use does not occur, but the word denotes those who

Digitized by Google

9 *Let* love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good.

10 *Be* kindly affectioned one to another [1]with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another;

[1] Or, *in the love of the brethren.*

11 Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord;

12 Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer;

13 Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality.

14 Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not.

15 Rejoice with them that do re-

---

were set in authority over a Church (1 Thess. v. 12), the presbyters (1 Tim. v. 17.) Their special qualification was probably the gift of government (κυβερνήσεις, 1 Cor. xii. 28), their duties being such as the restraint of disorder, correction of abuses, and enforcement of discipline. In a still more general sense the word is applied to ruling one's own house and children (1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12), and to directing the practice of good works (Tit. iii. 8, 14). This last meaning seems best suited to the present context, in which the work described as 'ruling' stands between almsgiving and showing mercy.

"*Diligence*," or earnestness in business (σπουδή), would be a quality especially needed in the superintendence of works of benevolence.

*he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.*] Whether he is consoling the mourner, or relieving the sufferer, let him feel and shew that the service is willingly and gladly rendered.

**9–21.** From the right use of special gifts, St. Paul passes on to enjoin principles and habits which are required in all members of Christ's body.

"*Love*" comes first, both as forming a natural transition from the thoughts in *v.* 8, and as the common element of the virtues which follow.

**9.** *Let love be without dissimulation.*] Render, *Let love be* **unfeigned**. Compare 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Pet. i. 22. "*Dissimulation*," introduced by Tyndale, is a much less happy rendering than either "feigning" (Wiclif), or "simulation" (Rheims).

In grammatical construction this and the following clauses to *v.* 13 are elliptical and unconnected; but their hortatory sense is evident, and in some cases their order suggests a connexion of thought, which is correctly marked by the division of verses.

Thus "*love*" can be genuine only in those who "*abhor that which is evil*," and "*cleave to that which is good*."

**10.** Again, between members of the one family in Christ love takes a special form, and should be marked by a tender affection like that of near relatives (φιλόστοργος):

"**In brotherly-love be affectionate** *one to another*." The emphatic order of the Greek is lost in the A. V.

*preferring one another;*] As brethren be more forward to pay respect than to receive it, "*in honour* **preventing** *one another*" (Douay Version), or "leading the way one for another, not in claiming but in showing respect."

**11.** *Not slothful in business;*] The whole passage refers to *Christian* duties as such, and would be better rendered, "**in zeal not flagging, in spirit fervent**"(Acts xviii. 25), **serving the Lord.**"

There is a close connexion of thought in the three clauses: active zeal must be sustained by fervour of spirit, and both devoted to the service of Christ: compare Col. iii. 24.

The other reading, "serving the time," has very little support from the MSS, and gives a less suitable sense, whether taken as equivalent to "*redeeming the time*" (Eph. v. 16), or as a caution that zeal and fervour must be moderated by opportunity. (Ambrosiaster.)

**12.** In this verse also the three clauses are connected in thought: joy and patience both grow out of perseverance in prayer.

The "*hope*" which St. Paul sets against tribulation here, as in v. 2, 3, is the definite Christian hope, "*the hope of the glory of God*."

**13.** *Distributing*] "**Communicating**" (Douay). The Greek word means, "to be, or act as, a partner," either by partaking (xv. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 1 Tim. v. 22), or by communicating, as here and in Gal. vi. 6.

The variation (μνείαις), "partaking in the *commemoration* of the saints," is an acknowledged corruption, derived from a custom unknown to the Apostolic age.

"*The saints*" are simply Christians as such (ch. i. 7): if in want, let them be relieved by their brethren; if on a journey, let them be received with hospitality. The two duties here and elsewhere enjoined by St. Paul were of special importance in the circumstances of the early churches (1 Tim. v. 10; Tit. i. 8).

*given to hospitality.*] Literally, **pursuing** *hospitality, i.e.* not waiting for the claim to be made, but eagerly seeking opportunities (compare ix. 30, 31; xiv. 19).

Digitized by Google

joice, and weep with them that weep.

16 *Be* of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but [1]condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits.

[1] Or, *be contented with mean things.*

17 Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men.

18 If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

19 Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but *rather* give place unto wrath: for it is written, [a]Vengeance

[a] Deut. 32. 35.

---

**14.** The expression, "**pursuing** *hospitality*," *v.* 13, suggests the other sense of the same word, "*persecute.*" The Apostle is thus led to anticipate the thought which he developes fully in *vv.* 17–21, that it is a Christian's duty to love his enemies, and overcome evil with good.

This precept is certainly derived from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 28), and proves that St. Paul, though he had not seen our present written Gospels, must have known the substance of Our Lord's teaching.

**15.** The same sentiment is expressed in the Talmud: "Let not any rejoice among them that weep, nor weep among them that rejoice." Compare Ecclesiasticus vii. 34.

Chrysostom finely observes that it is natural to sympathise with sorrow, but that it requires a noble soul to rejoice in others' joy.

**16.** The two precepts of *v.* 15 are combined in the wider principle, "*Be of the same mind one toward another:*" *i.e.* let each so enter into the feelings and desires of the other as to be of one mind with him.

This loving concord cannot exist, where the mind is set on "*high things*," such as rank, wealth, honour. (Compare Phil. iii. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 17.)

*condescend to men of low estate.*] Literally, "Let yourselves be drawn along with, *i.e.* yield yourselves up to, the lowly."

Compare Gal. ii. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 17, where the unfavourable sense belongs not to the expression "*drawn away with*," but to the context.

The adjective ταπεινός is used in the N. T. frequently of persons, never of things. It is better therefore to follow the same usage here, and understand it of lowly persons as in A. V.

A want of sympathy with the "lowly" bars man from man and class from class, so that they cannot "*be of the same mind one toward another.*"

Another chief hindrance to concord is marked in the warning, "*Be not wise in your own conceits*" (Prov. iii. 7, and c. xi. 25).

**17–21.** From the mutual duties of brethren in Christ, St. Paul passes to the wider relations of the Christian towards all men, and especially towards his enemies.

Enmity being the world's prevailing attitude, how must the Christian meet it?

**17.** The precept, "*render to no man evil for evil*," is derived from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt v. 38–48), and stands in noble contrast to the "lex talionis" of Pharisaic and Heathen morality.

The warm friend and bitter foe was undoubtedly the ideal hero of ancient Heathendom (see Pindar, Pyth. ii. 155; Isthm. iii. 81): yet even here a God of love left Himself not without witness, and it is a part of Christian piety to recognise the pure and elevated teaching of a Socrates, and to love the example of his forbearing and forgiving patience. See the interesting passage in Plato's 'Republic,' I. p. 335, where Socrates discusses the maxim "Do good to thy friend, and harm to thine enemy," and ascribes it to one of the Tyrants, not the Wise Men, of Greece.

*Provide things honest.*] Again, to disarm enmity, use such forethought that your conduct may not only be blameless in the sight of God, who reads the heart, but may also be "**honourable** *in the sight of all men*," through its transparent goodness and justice.

Here, and in 2 Cor. viii. 21, St. Paul follows the Septuagint Version of Proverbs iii. 4, which differs from the Hebrew and A.V.

The meaning is not that the Christian should seek the praise of men for himself, but that he should give no cause of suspicion or offence: a precept of the truest practical wisdom.

**18.** Peace is a mutual relation which may be broken on either side: accordingly the duty of living peaceably with all men is absolute, so far as it depends on ourselves, conditional so far as its possibility depends on others.

St. Paul unites the two aspects in a single sentence, which may be thus paraphrased:

"Live peaceably with all men, if through their conduct it be possible: at all events, as far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all men."

**19.** *Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath:*] "**Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place to God's wrath.**" Literally, "to the wrath:"



Digitized by Google

*is* mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

Prov. 25. 21.

20 [b]Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

21 Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

---

the reference of the Article to "**God's wrath**" is made certain by the quotation which follows: compare v. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 16; and Ecclesiasticus xix. 17, xxxviii. 12; Prov. xx. 22, xxiv. 29. Both the language and the thought are illustrated by Eph. iv. 27, which shows that by avenging ourselves we *give place to the devil.*

*Vengeance is mine;*] "**To Me belongeth vengeance,**" Deut. xxxii. 35. The exact order and literal meaning of the Hebrew are preserved in the Greek here and in Heb. x. 30, though both were lost in the Septuagint Version, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω.

It is further remarkable that in the latter part of the quotation St. Paul himself does not adhere literally to the Heb., "*and recompence*" (A. V. Deut.), but follows partly the LXX and partly the paraphrase adopted in the so-called Targum of Onkelos, "I will repay," and himself adds the words, "*saith the Lord.*" (Fritzsche.)

It is thus evident that the Apostle's purpose throughout the verse is to put in the strongest light of emphasis and contrast ("*not yourselves*"—"*I*") the truth that vengeance is not for us but for God. This meaning is quite lost, when the words "*give place to wrath*" are made equivalent to "resist not the wrath of your adversary," or "give your own wrath time to abate."

20. *Therefore*] The whole verse, except the connecting Particle, is taken exactly from the LXX, Prov. xxv. 21, 22. The Particle οὖν introduces the precept as an inference from the truth that vengeance belongeth only unto the Lord. A various reading (ἀλλά) of at least equal authority (Tisch. 8) gives a slightly different connexion: "avenge not yourselves, . . . but show kindness to your enemy."

*coals of fire;*] A full discussion of the phrase "*thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head,*" belongs to Prov. xxv. 21; but we must briefly consider it in connexion with the present context.

(*a.*) According to Chrysostom, and other Greek Fathers, the "*coals of fire*" are God's sore judgments, which will be heaped upon the sinner who hardens himself against deeds of love.

(1.) In favour of this interpretation are the apparent sense of the phrase in 2 Esdras xvi. 53, "*Let not the sinner say that he hath not sinned: for God shall burn coals of fire upon his head, which saith before the Lord God and his glory, I have not sinned.*"

(2.) The reference to divine judgments in the present context, "*vengeance is Mine, I will repay.*"

The chief objection is that urged by Augustine: "How is it consistent with love, to give food and drink to an enemy in order to heap coals of fire upon his head, if coals of fire here signify some heavy punishment?"

The objection is commonly met by a reference to such passages as Ps. xxxvii. 34, lviii. 10; Prov. xxix. 16; Luke xviii. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 14; and by the explanation that the "coals of fire" will be heaped only upon the impenitent, while deeds of love are meant to lead to repentance.

(*b.*) Augustine and other Latin Fathers understand "coals of fire heaped on the head" as an oriental figure of the *burning pains* of shame and remorse: and in support of this view we must observe that a very similar mode of expression is found in Proverbs close to the verses which St. Paul has quoted: "*a soft tongue breaketh the bone*" (Prov. xxv. 15).

The passage thus means, show to thine enemy such kindness as shall make him ashamed of his hatred; so wilt thou inflict the sharpest and the most salutary pain. The figure is probably that of the melting-pots. As the object of heaping coals of fire on a vessel is to melt down its contents, so here the object is to melt a stubborn heart, a process not least painful when effected by undeserved kindness. This interpretation is confirmed by the closing sentence of Prov. xxv. 22 (not quoted by St. Paul), "*and the Lord shall reward thee,*" namely, for the good deeds done to thine enemy.

The sense thus confirmed by the context of the original passage is required also by the present context, the general thought of which is summed up in the next verse, "*Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.*"

The phrase "*thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head,*" would be in the first sense (*a*) an incongruous appendix to the quotation, but in the latter sense (*b*) it helps powerfully to enforce the duty of loving our enemies, which is the main subject of the passage.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XIII.

1 *Subjection, and many other duties, we owe to the magistrates.* 8 *Love is the fulfilling of the law.* 11 *Gluttony and drunkenness, and the works of darkness, are out of season in the time of the gospel.*

LET every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are [1]ordained of God.

2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt

[1] Or, *ordered.*

---

CHAP. XIII.—CHRISTIAN DUTIES, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.

**1-7. OBEDIENCE TO RULERS.**—From exhortations to live peaceably with all men, and abstain from revenge, St. Paul passes naturally, but without any express mark of connexion, to the duty of obedience to civil authorities. This is a subject rarely noticed in his other epistles: see 1 Tim. ii. 2. Why then does he treat it so fully and emphatically in writing to the Romans?

(1.) The Jews at Rome were notorious for their turbulence; see note on Acts xviii. 2: and the Christians being regarded as a Jewish sect, and being actually followers of a Jewish Messiah, were likely to be suspected of revolutionary tendencies. How easily suspicion could be turned against them was seen a few years later in Nero's persecution.

(2.) There was a real danger that Christians themselves, even those of Heathen origin, might be misled by false notions of Christ's kingdom and its relation to the kingdoms of this world.

(3.) This danger was greatest at Rome, where Christianity was brought face to face with the Imperial power: for the Roman government, regarding religion as a matter of state policy, sternly repressed every innovation which threatened to disturb the public peace.

But though the circumstances of the Roman Christians may have furnished the *occasion* for the admonition, and prudence may have suggested the need of it, the duty of obedience is enforced by other and far higher motives. M. Renan's remark ('Saint Paul,' p. 477) that "Paul had too much tact to be an agitator," and wished the Christian to be "a man of order en règle with the police, of good repute in the eyes of Pagans,"—is an unworthy travesty of the Apostle's teaching.

**1.** *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.*] "*Let every soul* **submit to higher powers.**"

"*Every soul,*" though a common expression for "every man," retains a certain emphasis and pathos, which appeal for hearty obedience.

"*Higher powers*" (Wiclif's excellent rendering) include both the person and office of such as are set in authority: compare Wisd. vi. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 13.

*For there is no power but of God, &c.*] Read, "*For there is no power* **except from God: but** *the powers that be* **have been ordained by God.**" In enforcing the duty of submission, St. Paul clearly asserts a divine right of civil government, as derived from God the source of all authority and power: and he extends that divine right to all "*de facto*" rulers "as the bearers of a divinely ordained office" (Meyer), but does not touch any question of the Christian's duty in reference to conflicting claims on his allegiance.

**2.** *Whosoever therefore resisteth the power,*] Read, "**So that he which setteth himself against the power.**" The Greek words in *vv.* 1, 2 which we have rendered "**submit,**" "**ordained,**" "**setteth himself against,**" and "**ordinance,**" have all the same root, and give to the passage an antithetical force which cannot be preserved in English.

*and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.*] Read, "**Shall upon themselves bring judgment:**" see note on Matt. xxiii. 14. Here, though the judgment comes from Him whose ordinance is resisted, it is not *damnation* in the world to come, but temporal punishment executed by rulers as God's ministers in this world.

**3.** *For rulers are not a terror to good works,*] Read, "**to the good work.**" The "work" is mentioned rather than the worker, because the power of rulers extends only to men's actions. The verse shows *why* judgment will overtake those who resist, namely, *because* the office of the civil power is not to subvert but to maintain that moral order which is in its origin divine. St. Paul is enforcing the duties of *subjects*, and therefore regards rulers only as acting according to the true idea of their office. He was in fact writing in the earlier and better part of Nero's reign, while Seneca and Burrhus were still in power, before any general persecution of the Christians, but after he had himself suffered grievous injustice from the civil power (Acts xvi. 37; 2 Cor. xi. 25, 32). His argument

Digitized by Google

thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to *execute* wrath upon him that doeth evil.

5 Wherefore *ye* must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

7 Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute *is due;* custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.

---

applies to all *forms* of government, and to Heathen as well as Christian rulers: it has "a *general* validity based on the divinely ordained position of the magistracy, and not annulled by their injustice in practice" (Meyer). There is as little reason for Renan's sarcastic exclamation that "Nero was proclaimed by St. Paul a minister, an officer of God, a representative of Divine authority!"—as for Volkmar's wild conjecture that the second beast in the Apocalypse (xiii. 12), who caused "*the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast,*" represented St. Paul here recommending obedience to civil government.

*thou shalt have praise of the same.*] Read, "*praise* **from it,**" *i.e.* from the power.

4. *For he is the minister of God to thee for good.*] Confirmation of the last clause of *v.* 3, with which it should have been joined. The civil power (ἐξουσία, *v.* 3) is God's minister, and as such exists only for good to him that doeth good: 1 Tim. ii. 2.

*he beareth not the sword in vain:*] The sword as the emblem of the power of life and death was borne habitually (φορεῖν) by, or before, the higher magistrates, and that "*not in vain*" but with a serious purpose, for use against evil-doers. "Qui universas provincias regunt, jus gladii habent" (Ulpian, 'Dig.' I. 18, 6, § 8, quoted by Tholuck).

The Apostle in this passage expressly vindicates the right of capital punishment as divinely entrusted to the magistrate, "*for he is God's minister,*" appointed to execute His righteous vengeance.

*a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.*] Read, "**an avenger for wrath unto him that doeth evil.**" The words "**for wrath**" (omitted in a few MSS) answer to the preceding words "*for good,*" and their genuineness is confirmed by the renewed mention of "the wrath" (τὴν ὀργήν) in the next verse.

5. *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath but also for conscience sake.*] Read, "*Wherefore ye must needs* **submit,** *not only for* **the wrath,**" &c. The necessity is twofold, external on account of "**the wrath**" which the magistrate executes, and internal on account of conscience towards God. We thus see that "*wherefore*" refers to the whole passage (*vv.* 1–4) as setting forth the grounds of obedience.

6. *For for this cause pay ye tribute also:*] To avoid ambiguity, read, "**ye pay** *tribute also,*" Confirmation of *v.* 5. In the fact of paying tribute you acknowledge that character of the civil power which entitles it to obedience, namely that it is an ordinance of God "*for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well*" (1 Pet. ii. 14).

*for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.*] Read, "**for they are ministers of God, labouring constantly unto this very end.**"

"The A.V. has here '*Gods ministers,*' and in *v.* 4 '*the ministers of God.*' The expressions are altered in both verses in the version of "Five Clergymen," which I have followed for this reason, that in *v.* 4 the idea of serving *on behalf of God* is implied in διάκονος; whilst here that of serving or ministering *to God on behalf of the people* seems to be included also in λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ." (Riddle in Lange.)

A ministerial, not necessarily priestly, character is thus ascribed to rulers (see note on xv. 16): they labour "**unto this very end,**" *i.e.* unto that service of God which is described in *vv.* 3, 4, and referred to in the words "*for this cause.*"

7. *Render therefore to all their dues:*] Omit "*therefore.*" The verse is a summary exhortation, based on the nature of civil government as stated in *vv.* 5, 6, and appended without any conjunction, as in xii. 21. "Render to all who are in authority whatever they are entitled to claim."

*tribute to whom tribute is due.*] This is an excellent rendering of St. Paul's brief and

Digitized by Google

8 Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.

9 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love *is* the fulfilling of the law.

11 And that, knowing the time, that now *it is* high time to awake out of sleep: for now *is* our salvation nearer than when we believed.

---

elliptical sentence. The complete expression would be—"to him that claims tribute, render tribute:" but the shorter phrase is equally clear and far more forcible.

"*Tribute*" (φόρος), any direct tax on person or real property, and "*custom*" (τέλος), any indirect tax or toll on goods (Matt. xvii. 25; Lu. xx. 22), were both paid to the Roman government, and the agents who collected them were, to the Jews at least, objects of popular hatred and contempt. When, therefore, St. Paul exhorts his readers at Rome not only to submit to taxation, but to regard their rulers with due fear and honour, his counsel is in strong contrast to that of the "seducers and deceivers" who at this period were exciting the fierce fanaticism of their countrymen in Judæa, and "under pretence of inspiration were plotting innovations and revolutions" (Joseph. 'B. J.' II. xiii. 3). "The Jews at Rome shared the same turbulent spirit" (Suet. 'Claudius,' c. 25).

It is worthy of notice that the extortion of the Publicans had become so intolerable, that a few months after the date of this Epistle Nero proposed to the Senate the most stringent and sweeping reforms: see Tacitus, 'Annals,' xiii. 50.

8–10. Exhortation to Mutual Love.

8. *Owe no man any thing, but to love one another:*] From the duties that must be paid to all in authority, St. Paul passes very naturally to the wider duty of loving all men. "Pay every debt, let none remain due to any man, save that 'immortal debt' (Bengel) of mutual love which, however fully paid, is still for ever due."

*for he that loveth another*] Read, "*for he that loveth* **his neighbour**," &c.

So Wiclif rightly renders τὸν ἕτερον, *i.e.* "the other" implied in the expression "*to love one another:*" compare ii. 1, 21.

*hath fulfilled the law.*] "In and with the loving *there has taken place* what the Mosaic law prescribes in respect of duties towards one's neighbour, inasmuch as he who loves does not commit adultery, does not kill, steal, covet." (Meyer.) But see more in the note on *v.* 10.

9. On the order of the commandments of the 2nd Table, see note on Ex. xx.

*Thou shalt not bear false witness,*] The addition of this clause to the original text, in order to supply a supposed omission, is proved to be needless by what follows, "*and if there be any other commandment.*"

*it is briefly comprehended*] Or, "*it is* **summed up**." In Lev. xix. 18, sundry laws forbidding injury to one's neighbour are summed up in a saying which contains them all in principle, as it also contains all the commandments of the Decalogue, to which St. Paul here applies it. The several laws which flow from love are thus gathered up again in love, their fountain head.

10. *Love worketh no ill*] This emphatic rendering of the words οὐκ ἐργάζεται is justified by their position. "*Love*" (personified as in 1 Cor. xiii.) "*worketh no ill to his neighbour,*" neither the ills forbidden in the several commandments, nor any other.

*therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.*] "**Love therefore is the fulfilment of law.**" Compare *v.* 8. The argument of this passage is satisfied, if it be limited to the law of Moses, and its special prohibitions: but it is probable that St. Paul, by using νόμος without the article, pointed to a larger sense in which love is the fulfilment of law. For viewed in its idea and essence as a revelation of God's will, "*law*" requires for its fulfilment that we should not only cease to do evil, but learn to do well.

11–14. After his full explanation in *vv.* 8–10 of the exhortation, "*Owe no man any thing, but to love one another,*" St. Paul now resumes the exhortation, and enforces it by a special motive drawn from the shortness of the time, and then upon this motive founds fresh exhortations to vigilance and holiness.

11. *And that, knowing the time.*] "*And that,* **because ye know the season.**" On καὶ τοῦτο compare 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8; Eph. ii. 8. It recalls with fresh emphasis the preceding thought "Owe nothing but love," which is itself the comprehensive summary of all the

Digitized by Google

12 The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.

13 Let us walk [1]honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.

14 But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to *fulfil* the lusts *thereof*.

[1] Or, *decently*.

---

Christian duties enforced in this and the preceding chapter.

On εἰδότες, see note on vii. 7.

*that now it is high time to awake out of sleep:*] Read, "**that it is time for us at once to awake,**" &c.

The pronoun "**us**" (or "you"), omitted in the A. V., is addressed to believers (ἐπιστεύσαμεν), and demands of them an earnest vigilance, compared with which their ordinary life is as a "*sleep*" of the soul. So in the parable of the virgins, "*they all slumbered and slept.*"

*for now is our salvation nearer*] "*for now is* **salvation nearer to us.**" This latter rendering is favoured by the order of the words. The "*salvation*" meant is evidently the full and final salvation which shall accompany the second coming of the Lord. When St. Paul says of this that it is "*nearer than when we believed,*" it is clear that he thought Christ's coming nigh at hand. The short time since St. Paul and his readers first "*believed*" would have brought the Advent seemingly no nearer, had it been regarded as indefinitely distant. In fact, a constant expectation of the day of the Lord as fast approaching is the very attitude of mind which Christ Himself enjoined in His repeated warnings.

That expectation had from the first been modified by the caution, "*Of that day and hour knoweth no man*" (Matt. xxiv. 36). In St. Paul's mind the expectation was vivid (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 52), but the caution was not forgotten (1 Thess. v. 1, 2; 2 Thess. ii. 1).

The Aorist ἐπιστεύσαμεν points back to the first acceptance of the faith: compare 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 2; Acts xix. 2.

**12.** *The night is far spent, the day is at hand.*] Having compared the present moral condition of his readers to "*sleep,*" the Apostle carries on the figure, contrasting the present life with that which is to come as night with day: compare Heb. x. 25.

*let us therefore cast off the works of darkness,*] In accordance with the figurative use of "*sleep*" and "*night,*" the "*darkness*" also is to be understood in a moral sense, and "*the works of darkness*" are not only such deeds of violence or lust as men seek to hide under cover of night (1 Thess. v. 7; Ephes. v. 11), but generally all sinful deeds whose natural element is the state of spiritual darkness. All these, says the Apostle, "*let us cast off,*" as men arising out of sleep lay aside the garments worn during the night. For the literal sense of ἀποθώμεθα see Acts vii. 58, and for its application to moral habits compare Eph. iv. 22, 25; Col. iii. 8; James i. 21; 1 Peter ii. 1; Heb. xii. 1.

*and let us put on the armour of light.*] The interpretation "bright shining armour," does not agree with the figure employed, of night and day. "*The armour of* **the** *light,*" is the armour belonging to and worn during the light, that with which the Christian must be found clad in the day of Christ's coming, when the true heavenly light will arise and shine: compare Eph. vi. 11.

**13.** *Let us walk honestly, as in the day.*] For "*honestly*" (1 Thess. iv. 12), which is now seldom used in its proper Latin sense, read "seemly" or "**becomingly.**" Compare xii. 17, where "*things honest*" mean "*things* **becoming,**" and 1 Cor. xiv. 40, where for "*decently*" read "**becomingly.**" "As if the day, which is so near at hand, were already present, so let us walk becomingly." (Photius.)

To this passage St. Augustine ('Confessions,' viii. 12, 23) attributes his own remarkable conversion: "I seized the book, opened it, and read in silence the passage on which my eyes were first cast, 'Not in **revellings** *and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and* **jealousy:** *but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh* **unto lusts.**' I had no wish, no need, to read further: for at the end of this sentence immediately, as if the light of full assurance had been poured into my heart, the darkness of my doubts all fled away." For "*envying*" read "**jealousy.**" Revelry is followed on the one hand by lasciviousness, and on the other by strife and jealous wrath (ζήλῳ, Acts xiii. 45).

**14.** *But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ,*] In Gal. iii. 27 (written only a few months before this Epistle) St. Paul says that "all who were baptised into Christ did put on Christ," *i.e.* entered into fellowship of life with Him, and became members of Him. The fact of union with Christ, there asserted in the dogmatic sense, is the ground of the exhortation in this passage to "**put on**

Digitized by Google

Christ" in the ethical sense, *i. e.* to clothe the soul in the moral disposition and habits of Christ. The essential element of this union is the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit's power is needed continually to maintain and develope the life once bestowed. Each new step in the development of this life may be regarded as a new putting on of Christ, and so may be the subject, as here, of special exhortation. Compare Gal. iv. 19, "*little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you.*"

*and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.*] Literally, **unto lusts.** If σάρξ has here a purely physiological sense (Philippi) as denoting the material of the body, the prohibition is not absolute but limited by the words **unto lusts** (εἰς ἐπιθυμίας): take not care of the body to such an extent as to excite lusts (Meyer), or rather "in order to gratify lusts."

But the opposition between "putting on the Lord Jesus Christ" and "taking forethought for the flesh" makes it more probable that σάρξ here, as in cc. vii. and viii., denotes the flesh in its *sensuality and sinfulness:* and so the Apostle forbids altogether any forethought for its indulgence as necessarily aiming at, or at least tending to, the excitement and gratification of sinful lusts. The words **unto lusts** thus strengthen instead of limiting the prohibition.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on *v.* 1.

The reading ὑπό θεοῦ instead of ἀπὸ θεοῦ, though found in the oldest MSS. and generally adopted by critical Editors, is still regarded by many of the best interpreters as the error of a copyist misled by the ὑπό of the following clause.

The received Text (ἀπὸ θεοῦ) certainly seems to give a better and more pointed sense, by distinguishing the Divine origin of civil government in general from the actual establishment by God's Providence of existing governments.

## CHAPTER XIV.

3 *Men may not contemn nor condemn one the other for things indifferent:* 13 *but take heed that they give no offence in them:* 15 *for that the apostle proveth unlawful by many reasons.*

HIM that is weak in the faith receive ye, *but* [1]not to doubtful disputations.

2 For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.

[1] Or, *not to judge his doubtful thoughts.*

### CHAP. XIV.—EXHORTATION TO MUTUAL FORBEARANCE AMONG CHRISTIANS.

The great principle of Christian love commended in the preceding chapter is here applied to enforce the special duty of mutual forbearance in things indifferent. This general connexion of thought between the two chapters is clear and unquestionable: the more immediate and formal connexion being less obvious has been much disputed.

(1.) The expectation of the Second Advent, introduced as a motive to mutual love (xiii. 11), is naturally accompanied by an exhortation to watchfulness and purity (xiii. 12-14); and from this *incidental* admonition St. Paul now returns to his main thought (Fritzsche).

(2.) The warning against excessive indulgence of the flesh leads by a natural transition and contrast to the case of those who from weakness of faith observe an over-scrupulous asceticism (Meyer).

These views are both partially true, and both incomplete.

The expectation of Christ's second coming to judge the world runs through the whole passage (xiii. 11, xiv. 4, 10-12), as the constraining motive to mutual charity and forbearance.

Before applying this motive in c. xiv., to appease dissensions which were occasioned chiefly by a superstitious observance of things morally indifferent, the Apostle, with admirable wisdom, draws first from the thought of coming judgment a note of warning, not unneeded, especially among his Gentile readers, against a licentious abuse of Christian liberty; and so passes over (δέ, xiv. 1) to the opposite and less dangerous error or infirmity, for which he claims a charitable forbearance from those whose consciences were more robust.

1. *Him that is weak in the faith.*] "**But** *him that is weak* **in faith.**" Ἡ πίστις does not here mean "*the faith,*" *i. e.* the doctrine believed, but the man's own Christian faith in its moral and practical bearing, as a conviction of right and wrong: compare *vv.* 22, 23. The weakness is described by a

Digitized by Google

3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.

4 Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

5 One man esteemeth one day

---

Participle, not by an Adjective, and thus (as Godet rightly observes) is not treated as an inherent and permanent defect of character.

*receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.*] "*receive ye*, **not unto discussion of doubts.**" Admit the weak brother to Christian fellowship, take him to yourselves, but not to discuss and pass judgments upon any doubts that he entertains. This plea for a kindly reception of the weak brethren implies that they, i. e. the Jewish Christians, were not the predominant part of the Christian community at Rome. For διακρίσεις see 1 Cor. xii. 10; Heb. v. 14: and for διαλογισμῶν see note on i. 21. The meaning "*doubts*" is clear in Phil. ii. 14.

**2.** *For one believeth that he may eat all things:*] "**One man hath faith to eat all things.**" For this meaning of πιστεύει compare Demosthenes, 'Against Onetor,' p. 866 (προέσθαι δὲ τὴν προῖκ' οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν), "he had not confidence, i. e. was too cautious, to give up the dowry."

*another, who is weak, eateth herbs.*] "**But he that is weak,**" &c. The scruple here described refers to eating flesh at all, not only flesh of unclean animals or of idol-sacrifices. The weak Christian lived on vegetables.

In regard to the motive of this scrupulous abstinence, see Introduction, § 7.

St. Paul, regarding the matter itself as indifferent, expresses no disapproval of either practice, but only of the uncharitable feelings with which it may be associated. The strong must not despise the weak as narrow-minded and superstitious, nor the weak judge and condemn the strong as unscrupulous and irreverent. Similar cautions are much needed in discussions of the present day concerning "temperance."

**3.** *for God hath received him.*] Compare Pss. xxvii. 10, lxv. 4, lxxiii. 24, where the LXX use the same Greek word, also John xiv. 3; Rom. xv. 7; and Clemens Rom., 1 Cor. 49: ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς ὁ Δεσπότης. St. Paul's meaning is, "Condemn not for his freedom the man whom God has taken to Himself and received into His Church in this freedom:" 1 Cor. x. 29; Gal. v. 13.

**4.** *Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?*] Read, "**another's servant,**" *i. e.* God's, or Christ's, according as Θεός or Κύριος is adopted in the close of the verse. The question, "*Who art thou?*" addressed to "*the weak*" in faith, rebukes his presumption in condemning the freedom which God has not condemned. Compare ix. 20.

The word οἰκέτης, rare in N. T., denotes a household servant, distinguished from ordinary slaves (Plat. Legg. vi., p. 763 A) as being more closely connected with the family. (Meyer.)

*to his own master he standeth or falleth.*] The figurative expression "*standeth or falleth*" is variously understood:

(1.) He is acquitted or condemned, not by your judgment, but by that of God (Ps. i. 5; Lu. xxi. 36; 1 Cor. iv. 4).

(2.) Whether in the use of his liberty he does well or ill, stands upright or falls into sin, is a matter that concerns his own Master, not thee (1 Cor. x. 12, xvi. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 8, &c.; c. xi. 22). This latter interpretation is confirmed by what follows. What St. Paul thus forbids is not a kindly concern for a fellow-servant's safety, but a censorious interference with his freedom. For the Dative see Winer, pp. 263, 265, and below, *vv.* 6, 7, 8.

*Yea, he shall be holden up:*] Read, "**But he shall stand.**" Matt. xii. 26; Lu. xi. 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

*for God is able to make him stand.*] Read, "**for the Lord is mighty,**" &c.: Wiclif's vigorous rendering, based on the reading of nearly all the best MSS and oldest versions (δυνατεῖ γάρ ὁ Κύριος). St. Paul's confident assurance that the man, who in the strength of faith asserts his freedom in things indifferent, will be kept in his uprightness, rests on the might of Christ "**the Lord.**"

**5.** *One man esteemeth one day above another.*] If "for" (γάρ) be restored (Tisch. 8), it must be regarded either as a repetition, or better as a confirmation, of the γάρ in *v.* 2, *i. e.* it strengthens the argument for the precept of *v.* 1, by a second example of difference between the weak and the strong in faith: "*one man* **chooseth day before day:** *another* **chooseth** *every day.*" For the meaning of κρίνω see Plato, 'Republic,' iii. 399, F., and Æschylus, 'Agamemnon,' 471; and for the subject matter compare Col. ii. 16, "*Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day* (**feast**), *or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days.*" From that passage and from Gal. iv. 10, we see that Jewish Christians who were weak

Digitized by Google

above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be [1]fully persuaded in his own mind.

6 He that [2]regardeth the day, regardeth *it* unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard *it*. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.

7 For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself.

8 For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.

9 For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

[1] Or, *fully assured.*
[2] Or, *observeth.*

---

in faith were still influenced by a superstitious reverence for days and seasons which had been held sacred among the Jews. A rigid observance of the Sabbath was especially characteristic of the Essenes. Compare Ecclesiasticus xxxiii. 7-9: and on the Judaizing element in the Roman Church, see Introduction, § 7. There is not the slightest reason to suppose, with Ewald, that St. Paul is referring to the observance of the Lord's day.

*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*] The observance of this or that day being *in itself* a thing indifferent, it is enough that he who observes it and he who does not should "**each be fully assured in his own mind**" that he is doing right. The "*mind*" (νοῦς) is the seat of moral consciousness, and therefore of the "*full assurance of faith:*" cf. vii. 23, and iv. 21 (πληροφορηθείς).

**6.** *He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord.*] "**He that mindeth the day, to the Lord he mindeth it.**" It being presupposed that each is fully assured in his own mind that he is doing right, then he that sets his mind upon the day in question (τὴν ἡμέραν) and is zealous for its observance (φρονεῖν, Matt. xvi. 23; Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 2), does so for the Lord's sake, considering that "*this day is holy to the Lord*" (1 Esdras ix. 52).

The clause, "*and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it,*" must be omitted on overwhelming evidence: it seems to have been added for the sake of completeness, being implied in the Apostle's argument.

"The setting apart of special days for the service of God is a confession of our imperfect state, an avowal that we cannot or do not devote our whole time to Him. Sabbaths will then ultimately be superseded, when our life becomes one eternal Sabbath" (Bp. Lightfoot on Coloss. ii. 18).

*He that eateth, &c.*] The man who eats flesh, eats it unto the Lord, because he deems it right to use what God has given him for use; and he shows that he is fully assured of this, "*for he giveth God thanks.*"

In like manner "*he that eateth not*" flesh "*eateth not*" for the Lord's sake, and accordingly "*gives thanks to God*" for the simpler meal that he allows himself.

This passage proves the universal custom of thanksgiving before a meal (Matt. xv. 36; Acts xxvii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 30, xi. 24; 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5).

For the Datives see note on *v.* 4.

**7, 8.** Confirmation of the particular statements in *v.* 6 by the universal principle on which they rest.

In observing or not observing special days, and in eating or not eating flesh, a Christian (who is fully assured) does all "*unto the Lord:*" for this is the conscious aim of his existence, to live "*not unto himself,*" not for his own will and pleasure, but "*unto the Lord,*" for His glory, and according to His will.

Moreover he that thus lives unto the Lord, also dies unto the Lord: the ruling principle of the life is strong in death. "It is a great art to die well, and to be learnt by men in health." (Jeremy Taylor, 'Holy Dying.')

"*We are the Lord's,*" not our own, but His property, devoting ourselves to His service and assured of His protection. The Apostle in *vv.* 7, 8 is speaking of believers only.

**9.** *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived,*] "*For to this end Christ* **died and became alive.**" The shorter reading is best attested, and explains the variations: it also corresponds best with the following clause, "*that he might be Lord both* **of dead** *and living.*"

The Christian's relation to his Lord, both in life and in death, is founded on the facts of Christ's personal history For the life which the Christian lives "*unto the Lord*" is also a new life (vi. 4) derived from the new life of Christ, which made Him Lord of dead and living: compare viii. 38; Phil. i. 20. The new life on which Christ entered after His resurrection is described not by ἀνέζησεν, but

Digitized by Google

10 But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for [c] we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

[c] 2 Cor. 5. 10.

11 For it is written, [d] *As* I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

[d] Is. 45. 23.

12 So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

13 Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in *his* brother's way.

14 I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that *there is* nothing

---

by the simple verb ἔζησεν (as in Apoc. i. 18, ii. 8; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11), to correspond more closely with ζώντων.

The emphasis is of course on the words "*both dead and living*," as is shown by the καί—καί, and required by the connexion with *vv.* 7, 8.

Observe in ἔζησεν the inceptive force of the Aorist, "**became alive**," for which compare the Additional Note on i. 13, and Bernhardy, 'Syntax,' p. 382.

10. *But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother?*] Read, "**But thou, why judgest thou thy brother? Or thou too,** *why dost thou set at nought thy brother?*

If Christ is the Lord of all, what right has the weak to judge, or the strong to despise his brother? For, instead of judging each other, all are to be judged by the Lord. "*All*" is placed emphatically first, as the force of the argument rests on the universality of the judgment: compare ii. 6, 16, iii. 6, &c.

*the judgment seat of Christ.*] Read, "*the judgment seat of* **God**," and compare 2 Cor. v. 10, which was probably the source of the reading "*Christ.*"

11. The certainty of the universal judgment is attested by the solemn declaration of Isaiah xlv. 23, where for the Hebrew phrase, "*By myself have I sworn*" (Gen. xxii. 16), which is literally rendered in LXX, St. Paul, quoting from memory, substitutes the more frequent form, "*I live*," equivalent to "By my own life I swear:" compare Num. xiv. 21, 22, 28; Deut. xxxii. 40, where the LXX have ζῶ ἐγὼ ὅτι.

*saith the Lord,*] Added to Isaiah's words by St. Paul, to show that it is God who speaks.

The words which follow in Isaiah, "*the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return*," being only a further asseveration, are omitted by St. Paul.

*every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.*] Isai. xlv. 23. The Hebrew is correctly rendered in the A. V., "*Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.*"

Compare Jer. xliv. 26, where for "*sworn*" there is, as here, a various reading in LXX, "*confessed.*"

In Isaiah the oath of homage (Isai. xix. 18; Jos. xxiii. 7; 2 Chr. xv. 14), as well as the bended knee, marks the adoring submission of the whole world to Jehovah, and the solemn confession of His sovereignty.

The notion of "confessing sins to the Judge" (Œcumenius) is out of place in this verse, though it follows in the next.

12. *So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.*] "*So then* **each one of us for himself shall give account to God.**" On God's supremacy rests His exclusive right of judgment: so when the former is confessed by "*every tongue*," it follows that each will answer for himself to his rightful Judge. By bringing together the emphatic words, "**each one of us for himself**," we give prominence to the exact point, on which the application in the next verse is based.

13. *Let us not therefore judge one another any more:*] "**No longer therefore let us judge one another.**" The warning against judging is now addressed to both parties, and so St. Paul passes over to the admonition addressed to the strong in faith.

*but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way.*] "**But judge ye this rather, not to put an offence before your brother, or a stumbling-block.**"

The two words πρόσκομμα and σκάνδαλον differ in their proper material sense as a "block" against which the foot strikes, and a "trap" in which it is caught; but in the figurative and moral sense they are used indifferently, and rendered in the A. V. either "offence," or "stumbling-block." See notes on ix. 33, Matt. xvi. 23. Here it is better to render πρόσκομμα by the same word "offence" as in *v.* 20.

*judge this*] "**judge ye this.**" The Pronoun must be expressed in English to show the change of Person: let this be your judgment and your determination. For this sense of κρίνω see 1 Cor. ii. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; Tit. iii. 12.

14. *by the Lord Jesus,*] Read "**in** *the Lord*

Digitized by Google

[1] Gr. *common.*
[1] Gr. *common.*
[1] Gr. *according to charity.*
[e] 1 Cor. 8. 11.

[1]unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be [1]unclean, to him *it is* unclean.

15 But if thy brother be grieved with *thy* meat, now walkest thou not [1]charitably. [e]Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.

16 Let not then your good be evil spoken of:

17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

18 For he that in these things

---

*Jesus.*" The conviction is that of a mind dwelling *in communion with Christ*, and therefore enlightened by His Spirit.

"*Nothing*," *i. e.*, according to the context, no kind of food.

"*Unclean:*" Marg. "common:" see notes on Acts x. 14, 28; xi. 8.

"*Unclean of itself:*" δι' ἑαυτοῦ, "per se," "of its own nature," apart from conscientious scruples. The rendering "through him" (δι' αὐτοῦ, referred to Christ) "that is, on account of His evangelic legislation" (Theodoret) is fantastic and arbitrary. The meaning is not that the distinction between clean and unclean meats was abolished: for "the weak in faith" objected to eating flesh at all, and this objection was not founded on the law of Moses, but on ascetic notions, such as those of the Essenes.

*but to him, &c.*] Read, "**except** *to him*," *&c.* It is not "*unclean of itself*," it is not unclean "**except**," **&c.**: compare for this use of εἰ μή Luke iv. 26, 27; Gal. i. 7, ii. 16, &c. Thus in enforcing the admonition of *v.* 13, St. Paul first asserts fully and directly the *principle* of freedom, and then adds the *exception*, by which its practice ought to be modified: for the scruple of the weak brother is valid so far as *his conscience* is concerned. It is this *exception* that forms the essential part of the argument, for on this is founded the preceding exhortation not to scandalise the weak brother.

**15.** *But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat,*] "**For if because of meat thy brother is grieved**" (Rheims). "**For**" is unquestionably the true reading, it brings in a reason for the exhortation expressed in *v.* 13, and founded on the closing words of *v.* 14.

The whole argument is perfectly clear when we reduce St. Paul's rhetorical style to the simpler logical order:

(1.) "to him it is unclean" (*v.* 14).

(2.) "put not a stumbling-block in his way" (*v.* 13).

(3.) "for if because of meat thy brother is grieved, **thou art no longer walking according to charity**" (*v.* 15).

*Destroy not, &c.*] The weak brother is "*grieved*," *i. e.* vexed in conscience, morally pained (Eph. iv. 30) by seeing the strong indulge in what he deems sinful. This grief may tend to his destruction, and that in more ways than one: he may either be repelled from the Christian faith, which seems to be associated with sinful practice, or he may be seduced by your example into a cowardly acquiescence in that which to him is sinful (1 Cor. viii. 12). Give up thy freedom and eat no flesh, rather than thus lead into perdition him for whom Christ gave up His life to save him from perdition. "Make not thy meat of more account than Christ made His life" (Bengel).

"*Thy meat*," "that meat of thine": there is a touch of scorn in the pronoun; "Non sine indignatione pronomen adjectum" (Beelen).

**16.** *Let not therefore your good be evil spoken of:*] This is addressed, as the whole passage (*vv.* 13–23), to those who are strong in faith: the Plural is used in laying down general principles (*vv.* 1, 7–9, 13, 16, 19; xv. 1), the Singular in applying them to special cases (*vv.* 2–6, 10, 15, 20–23).

"*Your good*," that which is emphatically *your* special advantage, can only mean, in accordance with the context, your stronger faith and fuller liberty; the reading "our good" would give the same general sense, referring to the "knowledge and persuasion in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean in itself" (*v.* 14). Compare 1 Cor. viii. 4, 7. 9; x. 29, 30.

Let no uncharitable use of your liberty give occasion to the weak in faith to condemn and speak evil of that which is to you a real good.

**17.** *For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink;*] "The kingdom of God, typified by the O. T. theocracy, is God's dominion over the heart, instituted and administered by Christ: it is the heavenly sphere of life, in which God's word and Spirit govern, and whose organ on earth is the Church" (Lange). Here the Apostle's point of view is that of our Saviour's saying (Luke xvii. 20, where, however, see note), "*The kingdom of God is within you*": its essence lies not in things external, as eating and drinking, but in the inward graces of the spiritual life. The following clause, "*he that in these things serveth Christ*," shows that these graces are here regarded as active principles of the Christian life.

Digitized by Google

serveth Christ *is* acceptable to God, and approved of men.

19 Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

20 For meat destroy not the work of God. [a]All things indeed *are* pure; but *it is* evil for that man who eateth with offence.

21 *It is* good neither to eat [b]flesh, nor to drink wine, nor *any thing* whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.

22 Hast thou faith? have *it* to thyself before God. Happy *is* he

[a] Tit. i. 15.
[b] 1 Cor. 8. 13.

---

"*Righteousness*" is therefore presented not in its judicial aspect as the relation established by God's justifying sentence, but in its moral aspect as a grace to be exercised and developed, as in fact "the germ, of which holiness is the unfolded and perfected plant" (Forbes): compare vi. 19, Eph. iv. 24, and note on i. 17.

"*Peace*" in like manner is not simply the state of reconciliation to God (v. 1), but the resulting disposition, the spirit of peace abiding in the heart and shedding a holy calm over the life.

"*Joy in the Holy Ghost*" is the holy gladness which the Spirit of God breathes around those who "*live in the Spirit*": Gal. v. 22, 25; Rom. xv. 13; 1 Thess. i. 6.

The strongest in faith best know that "*the kingdom of God*" consists in these spiritual graces, not in anything external as eating or drinking; they therefore ought to be most ready to use their liberty in such matters wisely and charitably. Thus with admirable skill and force of argument, the Apostle appeals to faith itself against any misuse of the liberty which faith bestows.

**18.** *For he that in these things serveth Christ*] The variation "*he that* **herein** *serveth Christ* (ἐν τούτῳ)," is most strongly attested; it extends the thought from the three graces just mentioned to the whole sphere in which they are combined. He "**herein** *serveth Christ*," who for the love of Christ serves his brethren in the exercise of such graces as righteousness, peace, and joy; and so doing he is both "*well pleasing to God*," who judges the heart, and "*approved by men*," who see his good deeds. Thus he wins the goodwill of his brother, instead of putting a stumbling-block in his way.

**19.** *the things which make for peace,*] More simply "**the things of peace.**" The exhortation, "*let us follow*," founded on *vv.* 17, 18, gives a much better sense than either a question, "Do we then follow?" or an assertion of the Apostle's own practice, "We therefore follow."

*and things wherewith one may edify another.*] Compare 1 Thess. v. 11.

**20.** *For meat, destroy not.*] Read **destroy thou not**: the Singular marks the return to the special case; see note on *v.* 16.

"*The work of God*" must be understood in accordance with the exhortation in *v.* 19 to "*edify*" or build up each other. Thy brother, as a Christian, is "*God's building*" (1 Cor. iii. 9). Do not for the sake of mere food fight against God by pulling down and destroying what He has built up. "*Destroy*" is here used in its proper etymological sense (κατάλυε, "destrue") not, as in *v.* 15, in the sense of eternal perdition (ἀπόλλυε).

*All things indeed are pure.*] *I.e.* all kinds of food are morally clean (*v.* 14).

*but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.*] The sense is well expressed by Tyndale's paraphrase "who eateth with hurt of his conscience." If thou cause thy brother to eat against his conscience, it is a sin to him, and so thou art destroying God's work in him for the sake of food. On διὰ προσκόμματος "with offence as an attendant circumstance," see note on ii. 27.

**21.** *It is good neither to eat flesh,*] "**Not** *to eat flesh*," that is to eat no flesh of any kind, and to drink no wine "*is good*" (καλόν), is worthy and noble conduct in one who denies himself rather than offend a brother (1 Cor. viii. 13).

*nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth,*] Read "**nor to do anything whereat &c.**" The interpretation answering to the A.V., "*nor* to eat or drink *anything whereby &c.*," is too limited. St. Paul extends the maxim to all actions which are in themselves morally indifferent.

*or is offended, or is made weak.*] If these two clauses are retained, we must render the last—"**or is weak:**" it extends the maxim beyond matters in which a brother is actually led into sin to those in which his conscience is weak, and may easily be grieved. But the genuineness of the clauses is doubtful (they are omitted in Tisch. 8), and to the evidence against them must now be added (r) Freisinger's 'Itala Fragmenta.'

**22.** *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.*] "Thou hast faith" (Wiclif, Geneva). "The faith which thou hast, have it," &c. (Tisch. 8, with א A B C: add r.)

Digitized by Google

that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

¹Or, discerneth

23 And he that ¹doubteth is damned if he eat, because *he eateth* not of faith: for whatsoever *is* not of faith is sin.

and putteth a difference between meats.

---

The sense is not materially altered by such variations, the same supposition being expressed in different forms. The question is the most lively and natural: compare xiii. 3. St. Paul hears, as it were, how the strong in faith opposes him saying "I have faith, and am convinced that it is allowable for a Christian to eat flesh and drink wine," and replies "thou hast faith? *Have it to thyself before God,*" so that God is the witness of thy faith, and parade it not before men to the offence of the weak" (Meyer, after Chrysostom.)

*Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.*] Read, "**judgeth not himself in that which he alloweth.**" The happiness meant is not the future "Messianic blessedness" (Meyer), but the present blessedness of a clear and undoubting conscience. It is a motive to charitable self-restraint addressed to the strong in faith: he who "judges not himself," who is so fully convinced, that he entertains no question or doubt about the rectitude of his conduct "in that which he allows" or approves in his own practice, should be content with this great happiness, and thankfully consent to restrain his freedom for his brother's sake.

**23.** *And he that doubteth is damned if he eat.*] "**But** *he that doubteth is* **condemned** *if he eat.*" The danger of the weak brother is now brought into striking contrast with the happy condition of him who is strong in faith, and so supplies a further motive to the charitable restraint of freedom.

The use of three kindred words (*κρίνων, διακρινόμενος, κατακέκριται*) gives to St. Paul's language a pointed force which cannot be preserved in English. For the meaning of *διακρινόμενος* compare iv. 20; Matt. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; James i. 6. He that thus doubts, wavers, and debates with himself whether it is or is not lawful to eat, is ipso facto and at once "*condemned if he eat,*" because he eateth not of faith: compare John iii. 18, "*he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed, &c.*" St. Paul does not *say* he is condemned by his own conscience, or he is condemned by God, but "the very act of eating condemns him, of course according to Divine ordering, so that the justice of this sentence is established not only before God, but also before men, and before himself" (Philippi).

*for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*] "**and** *whatsoever,*" &c. St. Paul here adds the major premiss of his argument. "Everything that is not of faith is sin": "This eating is not of faith:" "Therefore it is sin, and he is condemned already."

The important axiom, "*Whatsoever is not of faith is sin,*" has been very commonly misunderstood, and misapplied in controversial theology, through disregard of its grammar and context.

(1) St. Paul does not say *πᾶν ὃ μὴ ἐκ πίστεως* "everything except that which positively *is of faith;*" but *πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως* "everything which positively *is not of faith.*" In other words the Antecedent to *ὃ* is definite, not indefinite, and the proposition is limited to actions in which there is not a mere absence, but an actual defect of faith.

(2) This grammatical result agrees with the context, which shows that St. Paul is speaking only of actions done by a Christian who *does not believe* them to be right, but is at least *doubtful* of their propriety. Chrysostom's comment is admirable: "But all this is spoken by Paul concerning the case that lies before him, not concerning all cases."

On the position of the Doxology, which in a few MSS is placed at the end of this chapter, and on the relation of chapters xv. xvi. to the other portion of the Epistle, see Introduction, § 8.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on *v.* 11.

In Isaiah xlv. 23, the Vatican MS of the LXX has *καὶ ὀμεῖται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τὸν Θεόν* (Sinait. *τὸν Κύριον*). But the Alexandrine Codex reads *ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ*.

The variation may possibly have been first made by St. Paul in quoting the passage freely here and in Phil. ii. 11, and afterwards carried back into the text of the LXX, as in the cases mentioned in the note on iii. 12. But the similar variation, *ὡμολόγησα* for *ὤμοσα*, in Jer. xliv. 26, throws some doubt upon the conjecture that the various readings of the LXX in Isai. xlv. 23, have been caused by the reflex action of quotation.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XV.

*1 The strong must bear with the weak. 2 We may not please ourselves, 3 for Christ did not so. 7 but receive one the other, as Christ did us all, 8 both Jews 9 and Gentiles. 15 Paul excuseth his writing, 28 and promiseth to see them, 30 and requesteth their prayers.*

WE then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

2 Let every one of us please *his* neighbour for *his* good to edification.

3 For even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, [c] The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me.

[c] Ps. 69. 9.

4 For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

5 [d] Now the God of patience and

[d] 1 Cor. 1. 10.

---

CHAP. XV.—1-13. CONCLUSION OF THE EXHORTATION TO MUTUAL LOVE AND FORBEARANCE

**1.** *We then that are strong*] Read, "**But we,**" &c. There is the closest connection between this and the last verse of c. xiv.: from the danger of the weak St. Paul naturally passes over (δέ) to the duty of the strong towards them. It is thoroughly characteristic of St. Paul to associate himself with those on whom he is enforcing a duty, and also to acknowledge fully the advantage of that freedom and strength of faith which he is urging them to exercise with a loving forbearance.

"The infirmities" (ἀσθενήματα) of the weak are the acts in which their weakness of faith is shown, such as needless scruples or erroneous judgments: these the strong are well able, as they are in duty bound, to bear with loving patience (Gal. vi. 2; Apoc. ii. 2, 3).

**2.** *Let every one of us please his neighbour*] The duty of bearing the infirmities of the weak requires that we should not do the very opposite, "*please ourselves,*" *i.e.* indulge our own will and pleasure, in displaying our superior intelligence and freedom, but rather "*let* **each** *of us please his neighbour,*" conciliate him by forbearance and loving sympathy (1 Cor. x. 33; Phil. ii. 4).

*for his good to edification.*] "**With a view to what is good for edification.**" The effort to please must be directed to that which is good for our neighbour, *in relation to building him up* in faith.

Εἰς marks the "aim," and πρός the standard of reference (iii. 25, 26).

**3.** *For even Christ pleased not himself;*] "**For Christ also,**" &c. The duty of sacrificing our own pleasure for the good of our brethren is enforced by the one great pattern of self-sacrificing love (2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6).

*but, as it is written, &c.*] Instead of completing his sentence in the narrative style, St. Paul cites the exact words of Scripture, making Christ Himself the speaker. For a similar mode of quotation, see 1 Cor. i. 31.

The sufferer in the Psalm (lxix. 9) addresses God: "*the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me:*" it is for God's sake and to please Him that he suffers.

So in the Messianic interpretation (which St. Paul assumes to be known to his readers) the words are addressed to the Father by Christ, and prove that He pleased not Himself, but endured reproach for the Father's sake and to do His will.

The passage thus strictly interpreted satisfies the purpose for which St. Paul quotes it, even without bringing in the further consideration that all Christ's sufferings were endured for the good of His brethren.

**4.** The reason for bringing forward Christ's example in the words of the Psalmist is that all scriptures of the Old Testament (not its predictions only) were intended to be thus used "*for our learning.*" "*Learning*" is here used in a rare and antiquated sense for "**teaching**" (Wiclif), or "*instruction*" (A. V. 2 Tim. iii. 16).

*that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures, &c.*] Read, "**that through the patience and through the comfort of the Scriptures we,**" &c. "**The patience,**" as well as "**the comfort,**" is that which the Scriptures give: for the Apostle is here stating the purpose for which "*the God of patience and comfort*" (*v.* 5) caused the Scriptures to be written.

*might have hope.*] *I.e.* "our hope" (τὴν ἐλπίδα), the Christian's "*hope of the glory of God*" (v. 2). The purpose of the Scriptures is to promote the present possession of this blessed hope through the patience and consolation which they impart to those who endure suffering for God's sake.

Compare v. 4 for the connection between "*patience*" and "*hope.*"

**5.** *Now the God of patience and consolation*] "**And may** *the God of patience and* **comfort.**"

Digitized by Google

consolation grant you to be likeminded one toward another [1]according to Christ Jesus:

[1] Or, after the example of.

6 That ye may with one mind *and* one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

7 Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God.

8 Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises *made* unto the fathers:

9 And that the Gentiles might

---

Compare 2 Cor. i. 3, "*God of all comfort.*" The Greek word (παράκλησις) is the same as in *v.* 4.

*to be likeminded one toward another,*] "**To be of the same mind one with another:**" ἐν ἀλλήλοις, not εἰς ἀλλήλους, as in xii. 16.

What the Apostle prays for is not identity of opinion, but harmony of feeling: "idem sentire, idem velle."

*according to Christ Jesus.*] Compare Phil. ii. 2, in connexion with the following verses, especially *v.* 5, "*Let the same mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.*" Let each be so conformed to Christ, that all may be of one mind among yourselves: "ut unus quasi animus fiat ex pluribus." (Cic. de Amic. c. 25.)

6. *That ye may with one mind and one mouth.*] "**That of one mind with one mouth ye may,**" *i.e.* that being of one accord (ὁμοθυμαδόν) you may unite in one utterance of praise.

*God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*] There is no theological objection to the proposed rendering, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," which is fully justified by Eph. i. 17, "*The God of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" and by John xx. 17. "He is His God, because of Him He was begotten God" (Hil. de Trin. iv. 35, p. 96, Ellicott). Grammatical considerations are equally indecisive; but there is much weight in Bishop Ellicott's remark on Gal. i. 4: "As the term πατήρ conveys necessarily a relative idea, which in theological language admits of various applications (see Suicer, 'Thes.' s. v πατήρ), while Θεός conveys only one absolute idea, it would not seem improbable that the connexion of thought in the mind of the inspired writer might lead him in some passages to add a defining genitive to πατήρ, which he did not intend necessarily to be referred to Θεός."

For this reason, and because Eph. i. 17 is the *only* passage in which St. Paul directly and unquestionably calls God "*the God of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" it is better to retain the rendering of the Authorised Version, with the omission of "*even.*"

7. *Wherefore receive ye one another,*] This exhortation is an immediate inference from the preceding prayer for concord, and also a general conclusion of the whole argument beginning with xiv. 1. The appeal there made to one party, "*Him that is weak in faith receive ye,*" is here extended to both, "*receive ye one another,*" in accordance with the arguments addressed to both parties in xiv. 3–13.

*as Christ also received us*] For "*us*" read "**you,**" which agrees better with what goes before in *vv.* 5–7.

*to the glory of God.*] Not, "receive ye one another .... to the glory of God" (Chrysost. &c.): but, "**as Christ received you to the glory of God,**" *i.e.* received you both Jews and Gentiles into His Church that God might be thereby glorified. Compare Eph i. 12–14; Phil. ii. 11.

The interpretation proposed by Grotius —"received you into the glory of God," *i.e.*, into the inheritance of the future glory of the children of God—is not admissible; it would have required the Article to be expressed (εἰς τὴν δόξαν τ. Θ.), and it does not agree with the explanation, which St. Paul himself adds in *vv.* 8, 9, of what he meant by the words "*Christ received you to the glory of God.*"

8. *Now I say*] "**For I say.**"

The reading followed in A. V. (λέγω δέ) would have its usual sense, "But what I mean is this" (Gal. iv. 1; 1 Cor. i. 12). But λέγω γάρ is better attested and introduces more fitly the explanatory *proof* of the statement "*Christ also received you to the glory of God.*"

That this statement, and the proof of it, are addressed more especially, though not exclusively, to the strong in faith, is evident both from the repetition of the phrase used in xiv. 1 (προσλαμβάνεσθε), and also from the great prominence given in the following context to the reception of the Gentiles, to whom "the strong" for the most part belonged.

*that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision.*] "The whole passage should be thus rendered: "**For I say, that Christ hath been made a minister of circumcision for God's truth, in order that he might** *confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God* **for mercy.**"

Digitized by Google

glorify God for *his* mercy; as it is written, [e] For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.

[e] Ps. 18. 49.

10 And again he saith, [f] Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.

[f] Deut. 32. 43.

11 And again, [g] Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud him, all ye people.

[g] Ps. 117. 1.

12 And again, Esaias saith, [h] There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.

[h] Is. 11. 10.

13 Now the God of hope fill you

---

Circumcision was the condition attached to the promises. He therefore who was to be the seed of Abraham and the fountain of blessing to all nations, must be a "**minister of circumcision.**" He must fulfil the covenant of circumcision both in His person and in His work: He must be "*born under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we*" (Gentiles as well as Jews) "*might receive the adoption of sons*" (Gal. iv. 4, 5). Compare for the construction, 2 Cor. iii. 6, διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, xi. 15, Gal. ii. 17.

The words διάκονον περιτομῆς have been incorrectly interpreted in various ways:

(1.) "A minister of the true circumcision of the heart: ii. 28, 29" (Origen). There is nothing in the context to indicate this special sense of circumcision.

(2.) "A minister of circumcised persons," *i.e.* of the Jews, "that they might be brought within the promises, that God might be found true to them" (Cyril). "For to devote His activity to the welfare of the Jewish nation was, according to promise, the duty of His Messianic office. Comp. Matt. xx. 28; xv. 24" (Meyer). This interpretation is not absolutely inconsistent with the absence of the Article (iii. 30), which we should, however, have expected (Gal. ii. 8) but is clearly inadequate. "*The promises made unto the fathers*" were not that Christ should minister exclusively to the Jews, but that in the seed of Abraham all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

*for the truth of God,*] This is immediately explained in the appended clause: "*to confirm*" (rather, "**in order that he might confirm**") (*the truth of*) *the promises made unto the fathers.*" Compare 2 Cor. i. 20.

**9.** *And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy;*] The A. V. here follows the only admissible construction: the objections urged against it by Alford and others arise from not observing the double antithesis, between ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας and ὑπὲρ ἐλέους, and between βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων and τὰ δὲ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.

In the latter case the antithetical sense is more distinctly marked by bringing the contrasted clauses under the same grammatical construction.

Observe also that the main stress of the passage lies on the latter half of the antithesis. St. Paul is appealing more especially to "the strong," *i.e.* to the Gentiles, and in order to move them to greater forbearance and goodwill towards their weaker Jewish brethren, he shows that Christ Himself became in all things a Jew to fulfil God's promises to the Jews, and thereby to extend His mercy to the Gentiles. Even for Gentiles "Salvation is of the Jews," not secured by covenant, but granted of free mercy.

*For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles,*] See note on Ps. xviii. 49. David having been delivered from all his enemies, and raised to dominion over the neighbouring nations gives "the first utterance of a hope, which in later times became clear and distinct, that the heathen should learn to fear and worship Jehovah" (Perowne). In St. Paul's Messianic interpretation, Christ the antitype of David. foretelling the conquests of His kingdom, declares that in the midst of the Gentiles He will give thanks to God for their conversion.

Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, has here its usual sense in the LXX, that of giving thanks or praise.

**10.** *Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.*] Deut. xxxii. 43, where see note.

St. Paul follows the LXX. Either of the alternative renderings would be equally suitable to his purpose: "Praise his people, ye nations," or, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, ye who are His people."

**11.** *Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud him, all ye people.*] Ps. cxvii. 1. Both clauses are addressed to Gentile nations: in the latter there is a various reading, "let all the nations praise him" (Tisch.). From the other verse of the same short Psalm St. Paul may have drawn his antithesis of "*mercy*" and "*truth*" in *vv.* 8, 9.

**12.** *There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.*] Read, "*There shall be* **the root** *of Jesse, and he that* **ariseth to rule over Gentiles; on him shall Gentiles hope.**" See notes on Isa. xi. 10. St. Paul follows the LXX, as his argument requires nothing more than the general sense that the Messiah of the Jews should be the desire and hope of the Gentiles.

**13.** *Now the God of hope fill you*] "**And**

Digitized by Google

with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.

14 And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another.

15 Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God,

16 That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the

---

**may** *the God of hope,*" &c. From the last quoted word "*hope,*" St. Paul forms a title "*the God of hope,*" by which he may invoke (as in *vv.* 4, 5) an appropriate blessing on those to whom his previous exhortation has been addressed. "*All joy and peace*" have their root in the "*hope*" of eternal life, their element or vital atmosphere "*in believing,*" their fruit in the increasing abundance of their hope growing "**in the** *power of the Holy Ghost.*"

14-33. Occasion of the Epistle.

In *v.* 14 the Apostle passes on (δέ) from exhortation to an explanation of his own motives and intentions.

**14.** *And I myself also*] This is explained as meaning: "*I myself also,*" independently of the general good opinion which others have of you, i. 8" (Meyer). But there is nothing in the context to suggest this meaning, and the reference to so remote a passage as i. 8 is quite inadmissible. Chrysostom's interpretation is far better: "**Now even I myself,**" who so admonish and reprove you.

*that ye also are full of goodness,*] Read, "**that even of yourselves ye are** *full of goodness,*" *i. e.* even without being exhorted. Ἀγαθωσύνη, a Biblical word, does not mean (as Meyer says) "*excellence* generally (*that you also of yourselves are very excellent people*)," but it means "*goodness*" in the more special sense as a *disposition to do good.* (Compare Trench, N.T. Synon. 2nd Series, and Ellicott and Lightfoot on Gal. v. 22.)

*filled with all knowledge,*] From 1 Cor. viii. 1, 7, 10, 11, we see that St. Paul refers to the knowledge of spiritual truth which was professed by the strong in faith. There St. Paul points to a contrast, "*Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth*": here he ascribes to his readers a happy combination of *goodness* and *knowledge.*

*able also to admonish one another.*] "*able* **even** *to admonish one another,*" without need of being admonished by me.

**15.** *Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort.*] "**But I have written more boldly unto you in part.**" Parts of the Epistle, such as vi. 12-21 xi. 17, ff., xii. 3, xiii. 3 ff., 13, 14, *and especially c. xiv. throughout,* are written more boldly than a belief in their goodness and knowledge might seem to require. That the boldness lay not in the fact of writing at all to a Church which he had not visited, but in the mode of writing, is clear from ἀπὸ μέρους, which limits the bolder writing to parts of the Epistle. The order of the words forbids the connexion, "in some sort more boldly."

*as putting you in mind.*] "**as putting you in remembrance again,**" not as teaching you things of which you might be ignorant. The word ἐπαναμιμνήσκω is used with a delicate courtesy, as in Demosth. 74, Plat. Legg. iii. p. 688 A. Compare also 2 Pet. i. 12.

*because of the grace that is given to me of God.*] Read rather "**the grace given,**" or "the grace that was given": compare i. 5, xii. 3. The obligation of the Apostolic office is thus alleged as a reason for his boldness in putting them in remembrance of Christian duties.

"He comes down from the teacher's chair and converses as with brethren and friends and equals, a part which best becomes the teacher, to vary his discourse according to the profit of his hearers. See for example, how, after saying '*I wrote more boldly,*' and '*in part,*' and '*as putting you again in remembrance,*' he is not satisfied even with this, but adds with still greater humility of speech, '*because of the grace given unto me of God;*' as he also said in the beginning, '*I am a debtor:*' as if he had said, 'I did not snatch the honour for myself, nor rush upon it first, but God laid this upon me, and that by way of grace, not as setting apart a worthy person to this office. Be not therefore offended, for it is not I that rise up against you, but God that has laid this upon me.'" (Chrysostom.)

**16.** *That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ*] "**In order that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus.**" The special purpose for which the grace was given by God. Λειτουργός, "*minister*" and its derivatives are used in the LXX and N. T., both of ministering in general, and of ministering in things sacred. For the general sense, see

[1 Or, sacrificing.] [1]offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.

17 I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God.

18 For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ

---

Josh. i. 1, 2 Sam. xiii. 18 (Amnon's servant), 1 Kings x. 5, 2 Chron. ix. 4 (Solomon's ministers), 2 Kings iv. 43, vi. 15 (Elisha's servitor), Ps. ciii. 21, civ. 4, Phil. ii. 25, 30, &c., and note on c. xiii. 6. The special sense is very frequent in the LXX, and applies equally to the ministrations of Priests and Levites (Ex. xxxviii. 21; Num. i. 50, iii. 6, viii. 22; Neh. x. 39, &c.).

In the N. T. besides this proper application to the ministry of the Tabernacle (Luke i. 23; Heb. ix. 21, x. 11) we find also a metaphorical application to Christ (Heb. viii. 2, 6), to Christian ministers (Acts xiii. 2), and to all Christians (Phil. ii. 17, Lightfoot). In the present passage it is clear from what follows that St. Paul applies the term to himself as a minister of the Gospel appointed by Christ the Head of the Church.

*to the Gentiles,*] **"in reference to the Gentiles."** The Apostle represents himself as the ministering Priest, the preaching of the Gospel as his priestly function, and the believing Gentiles as his offering. In this connexion therefore εἰς τὰ ἔθνη cannot mean a "minister to the Gentiles," nor "a minister sent unto the Gentiles," but "a minister **in reference to the Gentiles**" whom he offers to God.

*ministering the gospel of God,*] Compare 4 Macc. vii. 8, τοὺς ἱερουργοῦντας τὸν νόμον ἰδίῳ αἵματι. "The preaching of the Gospel he calls a sacrificial work (ἱερουργίαν), and genuine faith an acceptable offering" (Theodoret). "This is my priesthood, to preach and to proclaim" (Chrysostom).

*that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable,*] Read "*that the* **offering of the Gentiles,**" &c., *i. e.* "that the Gentiles might be an acceptable offering" (Tyndale).

The Apostle's thought and expression are both taken from Isai. lxvi. 19, 20: "*And they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations.*"

"And none would blame a priest for being zealous to offer his sacrifice without spot. But this he said, both to wing their thoughts and show them that they were a sacrifice, and at the same time as an excuse for himself, that this duty had been laid upon him. For my sacrificing sword, he says, is the Gospel, the word preached: and the cause is not that I may be glorified, but '*that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable.*' For God has brought it to this, not so much honouring me as caring for you. And how can it be made acceptable? "*In the Holy Ghost:*" for not faith only is needed, but also a spiritual mode of life, that we may hold fast the Spirit that was once given. For not wood and fire, nor altar and knife, but the Spirit is everything with us" (Chrysostom).

**17.** *I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ*] **"I have my glorying therefore in Christ Jesus"**: it follows from the nature of my ministry (ver. 16) that I have a right to glory; but my glorying is not in myself, but "**in Christ Jesus,**" because as His minister I do all things in and through Him (1 Cor. xv. 31).

*in those things which pertain to God.*] **"in things pertaining to God"**: see Heb. ii. 17; v. 1, where the context refers to the duties of the Priest's office before God. St. Paul thus limits his glorying to the ministrations of the Gospel regarded as an offeriug made before the Lord.

**18.** *For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me.*] This is Tyndale's version and very accurate, but the meaning may be made clearer by a paraphrase: "For I will not dare to speak of anything except what has been wrought by Christ through me." The Apostle thus explains and confirms the limit assigned to his glorying in *v.* 17 as a "**glorying in Christ Jesus.**" "I will glory," he means, only of what has been accomplished not by me but by Christ through me.

According to M. Godet, "the only possible sense of the words *I will not dare to speak*, is this: It would be a rashness on my part to name a single sign of Apostleship by which God has not deigned to ratify my ministry among the Gentiles." That is to say, every possible sign of Apostolic power has been granted to my ministry. But surely the words "*I will not dare to speak,*" are very ill-fitted to express what M. Godet calls "the paroxysm of that glorying of which he spake in *v.* 17."

*to make the Gentiles obedient,*] Compare i. 5. The "obedience of Gentiles" to faith in Christ is what has been described above in figurative language as "**the offering of the Gentiles.**" The Apostle thus explains the second limitation of his glorying to "**things pertaining to God**" (*v.* 17), *i.e.* to his priestlike ministration of the Gospel.

*by word and deed,*] The means by which

Digitized by Google

hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed,

19 Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.

20 Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation:

---

Christ wrought through His minister are here briefly stated under the very usual antithesis of "*word and deed.*"

By "*word*" St. Paul means the Gospel which he preached, by "*deed*" or "work" (ἔργῳ) all that he had been enabled to do and to suffer in his ministry.

19. *Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God;*] Read, "**In power of signs and wonders, in power of the Spirit of God.**"

"*Signs and wonders*" were not all that Christ wrought by "*deed*" through St. Paul, and the "*power of the Spirit of God*" was exerted through him not only "*by word,*" but in many other ways. Thus the purpose of the two parallel clauses is not so much to explain more fully what is meant by "*word and deed,*" as to glorify the Divine power with which Christ wrought through the ministry of His Apostle.

The "*power of signs and wonders*" is not the "power of working miracles," but the power which miracles have as "*signs*" to convince, and as "*wonders*" to overawe, by the proof of a superhuman agency. St. Paul appeals to his miracles as "signs of an Apostle" in 2 Cor. xii. 12: compare Acts xiv. 3, xv. 12, and xix. 11.

By the "*power of the Spirit of God*" is meant "that extraordinary influence of the Spirit, which in a moment turned men from darkness to light." (Jowett.)

*so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum,*] Tyndale's translation is more correct: *so that from Jerusalem and* **the coasts round about** *unto Illyricum.* The result of Christ's working through His Apostle is here stated as if the preceding sentence had been affirmative in form, as well as in sense.

How does this statement, that Jerusalem was the starting-point of St. Paul's ministry, agree with his own representation in Gal. i. 17? (Lucht, 'On the last two chapters of Romans.') St. Paul is here describing *not the duration* but the *local extension* of his ministry: it reached, he says, "*from Jerusalem*" as far as "*unto Illyricum.*"

Damascus, the scene of his earliest preaching (Acts ix. 20), lies between these extreme limits, and so near to Jerusalem as to be fairly included in the parts "*round about*" it.

The more distant Arabia was not the scene of the Apostle's ministry, but only of his retirement (Gal. i. 17: see Lightfoot).

It was natural, we may add, for St. Paul to fix the starting-point of his ministry at the Holy City, from which the Gospel first went forth into the world, and where he had himself first joined the fellowship of the Apostles, and in friendly intercourse with Peter and James and Barnabas "*spake boldly in the name of the Lord*" (Acts ix. 28: see also Lightf. Gal. p. 88).

Chrysostom's interpretation, that St. Paul had travelled from Jerusalem *in a circle* round to Illyricum, including Persia, Armenia, &c., has no support in this passage or elsewhere.

The great road from the East to Rome, passing through Macedonia into Illyricum, reached the Adriatic coast at Dyrrachium. This Southern or Greek Illyricum was incorporated by the Romans with Macedonia, and therefore may well have been visited by St. Paul during the journey mentioned in Acts xx. 1, 2. In Illyricum, whatever extent we here assign to the region so named, St. Paul reached the Western limit of his missionary journeys, and was comparatively near to Rome. (See Conyb. and Howson, ii. 126.)

*I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.*] Compare Col. i. 25. The expression must be understood, as we see from the next verse, with reference to the special office of the Apostle to the Gentiles and his usual practice, namely, to preach the Gospel in the chief cities of each country that he visited, and to lay foundations on which others might build (1 Cor. iii. 10). This St. Paul could truly say that he had done from Jerusalem unto Illyricum.

20. *Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel.*] "**Making it however my ambition to preach the Gospel on this wise.**"

The better reading makes this a participial clause, dependent on the preceding sentence, and containing an important limitation of its meaning.

For the meaning of φιλοτιμεῖσθαι see 2 Cor. v. 9, and 1 Thess. iv. 11.

The mode of preaching (οὕτως εὐαγγ.) is explained negatively in this verse, and positively in the next.

*not where Christ was named.*] *I.e.* not where men had already been taught to believe



Digitized by Google

[i] Is. 52. 15.

21 But as it is written, [i] To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand.

22 For which cause also I have been [1] much hindered from coming to you.

[1] Or, *many ways*, or, *oftentimes*.

23 But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you;

24 Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled [1] with your *company*.

[1] Gr. *with you*, ver. 32.

25 But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints.

26 For it hath pleased them of

---

in Christ, and call upon His name in public confession and adoration: compare Eph. i. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Is. xxvi. 13, Amos vi. 10.

*lest I should build, &c.*] In 2 Cor. x. 12–16 the same principle is asserted with the strong emotion roused by the ungenerous conduct of his adversaries.

Baur's objection to the genuineness of this passage ('Paulus,' i. p. 357) is based on a misrepresentation of its meaning. For it is evident that St. Paul refers to the *oral preaching* of the Gospel, as requiring his personal presence hitherto in the East. His letters to the Colossians and Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16), are sufficient proof that in writing to the Church at Rome, he was not transgressing his rule to avoid building on another man's foundation.

**21.** *But as it is written,*] Isaiah lii. 15, quoted exactly from the LXX. According to the Hebrew, nations and kings shall be astonished at the exaltation of the suffering Servant of God, as a thing unheard and unknown. In the LXX the change in the form of the sentence does not materially affect the sense in which St. Paul uses the passage, namely to show that his practice of preaching where Christ's name was unknown agreed with the general character of the Gospel message as foretold by Isaiah. According to Fritzsche, St. Paul believed that Isaiah pointed especially to him and his ministry, predicting that Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles should carry the announcement of the Messiah to those Gentiles who had not yet heard of Him from other Apostles. But this is a mere travesty of St. Paul's meaning, invented by one who himself rejects the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii. altogether. See notes on Isaiah.

**22.** *I have been much hindered*] **"I was the most times hindered."** There were other hindrances, but the most frequent arose from the duty of preaching the Gospel in places where Christ's name was not known.

**23.** *But now having no more place in these parts,*] **"But now no longer having place,"** *i.e.* 'since no longer (μηκέτι) I have room.' In these regions, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, the Gospel message has been fully preached (*v.* 19), and Churches have been founded, so that there is no longer room for doing that which is the peculiar work of an Apostle, especially of the one "Apostle of the Gentiles."

*a great desire*] **"a longing"** (ἐπιποθίαν): compare i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11; Philipp. i. 8; with Bp. Lightfoot's note.

**24.** *Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey,*] Read, "*Whensoever I take my journey into Spain:*—**for I hope to see you as I pass through.**" The words "*I will come to you*" were added to complete the broken sentence, the conclusion of which is found only in an altered form in *v.* 28.

Meyer omits γάρ also: "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I hope to see you as I pass through." This makes all smooth and regular, but is against the evidence, and the broken sentence is quite in St. Paul's style.

On the intended journey to Spain see Introduction, § 6.

The visit to Rome was intended to be only in passing through, because the Christian Faith was already established there (Bengel).

*and to be brought on my way thitherward*] **"and to be sent forward thither."** St. Paul hoped to receive from Rome the same kindness and respect as from other Churches, which sent companions to escort him on his further journeys: Acts xv. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 6; 2 Cor. i. 16.

*if first I be somewhat filled with your company.*] **"If I may first be in part satisfied with your company,"** or "after that I have somewhat enjoyed you" (Tyndale), "enjoyed your acquaintance" (Cranmer). Compare i. 12 for an explanation of the nature of the satisfaction which St. Paul hoped for.

St. Paul says courteously **"in part satisfied,"** meaning "not as much as I might wish, but as much as circumstances shall permit" (Grotius).

**25.** *But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints.*] **"But now I am setting**

Digitized by Google

Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem.

27 It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.

28 When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain.

29 And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.

30 Now I beseech you, brethren,

---

**out unto Jerusalem, ministering to the saints."** In contrast to the hope of a future visit to Rome the Apostle's present and immediate duty is taking him away in the opposite direction. See Acts xx. 3, and note on i. 9.

"**ministering.**" The Present Participle implies that the journey in charge of the collected alms of the Churches was itself a part of the ministration to the pcor saints at Jerusalem: see 1 Cor. xvi. 4, 15; 2 Cor. ix. 1; and Introduction, § 2.

26. *For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia.*] "**For Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased.**" Cp. Luke xii. 32; 1 Thess. ii. 8. The word (ηὐδόκησαν) expresses the benevolent pleasure of a cheerful giver.

*to make a certain contribution for the poor saints.*] Read, "*to make* **some** *contribution for the poor* **among the saints.**" See note on xii. 13. "The contributor enters into fellowship with the person aided, inasmuch as he 'shares his necessities': κοινωνία is hence the characteristic expression for *almsgiving*, without however having changed its proper sense *communion* into the active one of *communication*" (Meyer).

The indefinite word "**some**" corresponds to the fact that the contribution might be more or less according to the ability and good will of the givers (1 Cor. xvi. 2; 2 Cor. ix. 7).

27. *It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are.*] "**They have been pleased, I say, and are their debtors.**" The γάρ not only resumes the previous statement, but confirms it by a further explanation.

*For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things.*] "*For if the Gentiles* **shared in** *their spiritual things.*" The Gospel, with all its spiritual blessings, which are the gifts of the Holy Ghost, was at first the possession of the Mother Church in Jerusalem, and from thence was communicated to the Gentiles. In return for these greater gifts the Gentiles owe a debt (ὀφείλουσιν) to the saints at Jerusalem "*to minister unto them in carnal things,*" *i.e.* in things which belong to man's bodily life, such as food and raiment. For this sense of "*carnal*" things as contrasted with spiritual, see 1 Cor. ix. 11. Observe that St. Paul applies to this "ministry of the body" the same honourable title λειτουργία which he has used above of preaching the Gospel (*v.* 16).

Observe also in proof of the Pauline authorship of this chapter (most unreasonably questioned by Baur) the delicate and unobtrusive coincidence with Gal. ii. 10.

28. *and have sealed to them this fruit.*] Compare Phil. iv. 17; the contribution (κοινωνία, *v.* 26) is as fruit brought forth by the Gentile Churches. By going himself with those who conveyed it, St. Paul would assure and certify to the saints at Jerusalem the faithful delivery of the gift by the seal, as it were, of Apostolic authority, more especially because the pillars of the Church at Jerusalem had expressly laid on him the duty of remembering the poor (Gal. ii. 10).

*I will come by you into Spain.*] Read, "*I will come* **back,**" &c., Plato 'Symp.' 193, c.

29. *And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing, &c.*] "*And I* **know that in coming to you,** *I shall come,*" &c. There is an emphasis on the pronoun. Thus the repetition of the word "*come*" is no empty tautology: the reason of the Apostles' confidence lies in the character of those to whom he is coming: he knows that in them there will be nothing to diminish the fulness of the blessing which he brings. Compare i. 8, 12. So in 1 Cor. ii. 1, "*And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom,*" the reason of the simplicity of the Apostle's preaching lay in the self-sufficiency of those to whom he came, and in their conceit of superior wisdom.

*the blessing of the gospel of Christ.*] Read, "**the blessing of Christ.**"

Godet rightly asks, "Would a forger writing under the name of the Apostle in the 2nd century, have drawn a picture of the future so opposite to the way in which things really came to pass?"

30. *Now I beseech you, brethren, for the*

Digitized by Google

or the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in *your* prayers to God for me;

31 That I may be delivered from them that [1]do not believe in Judæa; and that my service which *I have* for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints;

32 That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed.

33 Now the God of peace *be* with you all. Amen.

[1] Or, *are disobedient.*

---

*Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me.*] Read, "**And** *I beseech you, brethren,* **by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by** *the love of the Spirit,* **to strive** *together with me in your prayers* **for me to God**" (Five Clergymen). This urgent request for his brethren's prayers springs from the same confidence in their faith, which has been already shown in *v.* 29. Thus δέ is simply continuative, "**And,**" not adversative, "But."

"**by our Lord Jesus Christ.**" Compare xii. 1, "*by the mercies of God.*" Christ is the motive by which the Apostle beseeches his brethren, 2 Cor. x. 1.

"*the love of the Spirit*" is the love which is "*the fruit of the Spirit,*" Gal. v. 22; as to the mode in which the Spirit produces this love towards God and man, see note on v. 5.

**to strive.**] "Fervent prayer is a *striving* of the inner man against the hostile or dangerous powers which it is sought to avert or overcome, and for the aims which it is sought to attain" (Meyer).

**31.** *that do not believe.*] "**that are disobedient**" (Margin, after Geneva). See note on xi. 30.

Already on the eve of his departure from Corinth St. Paul feels the same anxious forebodings of what should befall him at Jerusalem, which he expressed so strongly during his journey thither, Acts xx. 22, 23; xxi. 13. Thus the Lord was fulfilling the promise made through Ananias to Saul at the time of his conversion, "*I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake*" (Acts ix. 16).

*and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints.*] "**and that my ministration which is for Jerusalem may prove acceptable to the saints**" (Five Clergymen). See 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 1. In this anxiety concerning his reception by the Jewish Church we see another undesigned yet strong proof that the epistle was written by the Apostle whose mission to the Gentiles was so invidiously regarded at Jerusalem. Compare Acts xxi. 21.

The various reading (δωροφορία) "bringing a gift" instead of "**ministration**" (διακονία), though found in the Vatican and a few other MSS, is probably an explanatory gloss.

**32.** *That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed.*] Or, "That having come unto you in joy by the will of God, I may with you find rest." (The reading ἐλθὼν adopted by Tisch. 8 with ℵ * A C does not affect the sense.)

"**in joy.**" Compare 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Cor. ii. 1.

*by the will of God.*] The necessity of this submission of the Apostle's will to the will of God was shown in the result: he came to Rome, but not "**in joy,**" nor to "**find rest.**" Compare i. 10, 12.

The Vatican MS. reads "by the will of the Lord Jesus," and other MSS have "Christ Jesus" or "Jesus Christ" "It has been observed that St. Paul's constant expression is, *by the will of God* (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; viii. 5; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; Rom. i. 10; Gal. i. 4). He has never written "according to the will of Christ," or any similar phrase (Tisch. 8). In Eph. v. 17, "*the will of the Lord*" is Christ's *moral* will: the will which directs the dispensations of Divine *Providence* is called "*the will of God.*"

**33.** *Now the God of peace be with you all.*] "**And** *the God of peace,*" &c. This concluding prayer arises so naturally out of the preceding thoughts, that it is quite unnecessary to assume that the Apostle's mind returns to the dissensions among the Christians at Rome (xiv.). Compare 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XVI.

3 *Paul willeth the brethren to greet many,* 17 *and adviseth them to take heed of those which cause dissension and offences,* 21 *and after sundry salutations endeth with praise and thanks to God.*

I COMMEND unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea:

2 That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also.

3 Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus:

4 Who have for my life laid down

---

CHAP. XVI.—PERSONAL MESSAGES, BENEDICTIONS, AND DOXOLOGY.

1, 2. COMMENDATION OF PHŒBE.

1. *I commend.*] "**Now** *I commend*": comp. 2 Cor. iii. 1; v. 12; &c.; Xen. Mem. I. vi. 14; Anab. III. i. 8. That Phœbe was the bearer of the Epistle, is very probable; it is clear from *v.* 2, that the occasion of her journey was some business in which she might require the help which this introduction was intended to secure for her.

*our sister.*] *I.e.* my sister in Christ and yours also: compare *v.* 23 ἀδελφός.

*which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea.*] Second and more special ground of commendation. The Feminine διάκονος (Demosth. 762, 4) occurs only here in the N. T. The proposed rendering "deaconess" (Five Clergymen), is open to the objection that it introduces into the N. T. the *technical name* (διακόνισσα) which is of later origin. The office was, no doubt, the same, namely, that of ministering to the sick, the poor, and the stranger. Even after the introduction of the technical name, the more general form (διάκονος) remained in use, as in Ignatius 'ad Antiochenos,' p. 96; Theodoret also, in the 5th century, calls a deaconess διάκονος. See Suicer's 'Thesaurus."

Cenchrea, or more correctly "**Cenchreæ**," was the eastern part of Corinth on the Saronic Gulf; distant about nine miles from the city. It was important as a fortress commanding one of the passes over the Isthmus, and as having an excellent harbour, which made it the emporium of trade with the East. The Church there was probably founded and organised by St. Paul himself.

2. *as becometh saints.*] "**in a manner worthy of saints**," *i.e.* with such kindness and hospitality as "*saints*," or Christian believers, ought to show to a sister in the Lord.

*and that ye assist her.*] Lit. "**stand by her**," as in 2 Tim. iv. 17. Both words (παρίστασθαι and πρᾶγμα) often refer to legal proceedings, and occur together in this sense Demosth. 1120, 26. It is probable therefore that Phœbe was going to Rome on legal "*business*." On the conjecture that Phœbe's destination was Ephesus, not Rome, see Introduction, § 8.

*for she hath been a succourer of many.*] "**for she herself also**." The legal representative of a foreigner or provincial was called in Latin "patronus," in Greek προστάτης. In allusion to the latter name and to the word παραστῆτε, St. Paul calls Phœbe a προστάτις, *i. e.* a "protectress" or "helper" of many and of himself among them. Wiclif preserves the play on words, "and that ye help her in whatever cause she shall need of you, for she helped many."

*and of myself also*] It is not improbable that Phœbe may have rendered service to St. Paul at Cenchreæ on the occasion mentioned in Acts xviii. 18. His vow seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness.

3–16. APOSTOLIC GREETINGS.

On this whole section in its relation to the rest of the Epistle, see Introduction, § 8.

3. *Greet Priscilla.*] "**Prisca**." See note on Acts xviii. 2. On the objection that Aquila and Priscilla were not likely to have been at Rome at the time when St. Paul wrote to that Church, see Introduction, § 8.

*my helpers in Christ Jesus.*] "*My* **fellow-workers**," &c. "Labour for the Gospel lives and moves in Christ as its very element" (Meyer). For the fact see Acts xviii. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 19. They were also fellow-workers in the trade of tent-making (Acts xviii. 2).

4. *Who have for my life laid down their own necks.*] Omit "*have*." The fact thus stated as a special reason for greeting them (οἵτινες, "quippe qui") is otherwise unknown, and the exact meaning of the statement is therefore somewhat obscure to us, though it must have been clear to the readers. In the assault of the Jews at Corinth (Acts xviii. 6–18), and again in the tumult at Ephesus (Acts xix.), Aquila and Priscilla were with St. Paul, but are not specially mentioned as incurring any danger for his



Digitized by Google

their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles.

5 Likewise *greet* the church that is in their house. Salute my wellbeloved Epænetus, who is the firstfruits of Achaia unto Christ.

6 Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us.

7 Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellowprisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me.

8 Greet Amplias my beloved in the Lord.

9 Salute Urbane, our helper in Christ, and Stachys my beloved.

10 Salute Apelles approved in

---

sake. Such occasions were frequent in the adventurous life of the Apostle.

*laid down their own necks.*] Read, "**neck.**" The Singular implies that the expression is figurative, as does the converse use of the Plural μητέρας in Mark x. 30, if the reading be retained. The most likely meaning therefore is that Aquila and Priscilla risked their lives, not that they literally put down their necks under the executioner's sword, nor that they pledged (ὑπέθηκαν) their lives to the magistrate for the safe custody of Paul.

*unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles.*] St. Paul speaks with emotion as of an event comparatively recent: yet sufficient time had elapsed for the matter to have become generally known among the Gentiles. These two circumstances correspond well with the supposition that the event had occurred at Ephesus in the tumult, and that St. Paul had recently heard of the arrival of his friends at Rome. It would be natural that he should thus commend them to his readers on the first opportunity, and should mention the thanksgiving of the Gentile Churches, which he had since been visiting.

**5.** *Likewise greet the church that is in their house.*] See Acts xii. 12; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15: Philem. 2. "The Church in the house" was not merely the Christian household itself, but a body of believers meeting for worship in the house of some leading member of the community.

It appears from the "Martyrdom of Justin," § 3, that as late at least as the middle of the 2nd century there was no fixed place of general assembly for the whole Church at Rome, but several small assemblies like this Church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. See Bp. Lightfoot, Col. iv. 15; and Bingham, 'Antiquities,' VIII. i. 13.

*Salute my well-beloved Epænetus.*] The word rendered "*salute*" or "*greet*" is the same throughout the chapter. Of "**Epænetus my well-beloved,**" nothing is known except from this passage.

*who is the first-fruits of Achaia.*] For "*Achaia,*" introduced from 1 Cor. xvi. 15. read "**Asia,**" and for its geographical meaning see note on Acts ii. 9. Epænetus, St. Paul means, was one of the first converts in Asia, "*the first-fruits*" of the "*offering of the Gentiles*" xv. 16.

In the spurious list of "the Seventy Apostles" ascribed to Hippolytus, Epænetus figures as Bishop of Carthage.

**6.** *Mary.*] Variations of the text make it uncertain whether Mariam or Maria was of Jewish or Roman origin, and whether the labours which gained her a special greeting were spent on the Apostle (ἡμᾶς) or on his readers (ὑμᾶς).

**7.** *my kinsmen.*] Since other Jews are mentioned in the context, *e.g.* Aquila and Priscilla (*v.* 3), it is thought that the persons distinguished by St. Paul as his "*kinsmen*" here, and in *vv.* 11, 21, were members of his family, not merely fellow-countrymen (as in ix. 3). On the other hand it may be said that in writing to a Gentile Church the Apostle might naturally speak of Jewish Christians as his fellow-countrymen or "*kinsmen according to the flesh*" (ix. 3): and the great number of persons to whom the term (συγγενής) is applied in this chapter makes it improbable that they were all of the Apostle's family.

*fellow-prisoners.*] "**fellow-captives.**" Andronicus and Junia (or Junias, if the name be a man's) are mentioned with especial honour; as soldiers of Christ they had shared at some time in St. Paul's captivity (see 2 Cor. vi. 5; xi. 23; and Col. iv. 10): though not themselves here styled "*Apostles,*" as Chrysostom and others have thought (see note at end) they were well known to the Apostles, and had been among the earliest disciples (cf. Acts xxi. 16), having become Christians before St. Paul himself.

**8, 9.** *Amplias.*] A contraction of Ampliatus, which fuller form is common in the sepulchral inscriptions of persons connected with Cæsar's household (see Introd. § 8).

The next name "**Urbanus,**" (or "Urban," not "*Urbane*") is found, as here, in juxtaposition with Ampliatus in a list of imperial freedmen, on an inscription A.D. 115.

Digitized by Google

Christ. Salute them which are of Aristobulus' [1]*household*.

Or, friends.

11 Salute Herodion my kinsman. Greet them that be of the [1]*household* of Narcissus, which are in the Lord.

Or, friends.

12 Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which laboured much in the Lord.

13 Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine.

14 Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them.

---

*our helper in Christ.*] Rather, "**Our fellow-labourer in Christ;**" not a personal companion of St. Paul, like those whom he calls "*my fellow-labourers*" (*vv.* 3, 21), but one active in the same cause of Christ, with St. Paul and his readers.

"*Stachys*" has no distinction but that of being, like Ampliatus, dear to the Apostle in Christian love.

The names Stachys, Apelles, Aristobulus, Narcissus, Tryphæna, and Tryphosa, Rufus, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobus, Philologus, Julia, and Nereus occur more or less frequently in inscriptions of Cæsar's household. (See Introd. § 8, and Bp. Lightfoot's 'Philippians,' p. 172.)

**10.** *Apelles approved in Christ.*] *I.e.* the tried Christian: as Origen suggests, Apelles had probably endured much tribulation, and so had been tried and approved: cf. v. 3, 4. The name occurs as that of a Jew in Horace, 1 Sat. v. 100.

*Aristobulus' household.*] Literally, "those of Aristobulus," more probably his servants than kinsmen (1 Cor. i. 11). As only certain of them (τοὺς ἐκ τῶν 'A.) are saluted, namely, as in *v.* 11, those who were "*in the Lord,*" it is likely that Aristobulus himself was not a Christian.

It is not improbable that this Aristobulus was "Aristobulus the younger" (Joseph. 'Antiq.' xx. i. 2), thegrandson of Herod the Great, and brother of Agrippa and Herod, kings of Judæa and Chalcis, who lived in Rome in a private station (Bell. Jud. II. xi. 6), and died there *not before* A.D. 45.

Being very friendly to the Emperor Claudius (Jos. 'Antiq.' l. c.) he may have bequeathed his slaves to him, and they thus became part of Cæsar's household, though still distinguished by the name of their late master: as servants of Aristobulus many of them would naturally be Jews, and so likely to become hearers of the Gospel. See Lightfoot on Philippians, p. 172, and 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography,' "Aristobulus," 5.

**11.** *Herodion my kinsman.*] See on *v.* 7. Being St. Paul's kinsman Herodion was a Jew, and very probably (as we may conjecture from his name and the immediate juxtaposition) one "*of the household of Aristobulus.*" (Lightfoot.)

*Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord.*] This was probably the wealthy and powerful freedman of Claudius, whose death in prison in the year A.D. 55 is described by Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 1. In this case there is no real anachronism, as Lucht thinks, p. 147. For either by confiscation, which Lucht supposes, or by the law of succession, the household of the freedman of Claudius would pass into the possession of Nero, retaining the name of their deceased owner under the form Narcissiani, οἱ Ναρκίσσου. See 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiq.' "Libertus," and Lightfoot, 'Philippians,' p. 173.

**12.** *Tryphæna* is made a prominent character in the Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla.

*Tryphæna and Tryphosa* were probably sisters. Their names both meaning "dainty" or "luxurious" are contrasted with their "toiling" in the Lord. Both names are found in connexion with the imperial household about this date.

Observe how St. Paul distinguishes "*Persis*" as "*the beloved,*" not "*my beloved,*" as in *v.* 8. Her many labours in the Lord were performed on some definite occasion now past; Tryphæna and Tryphosa were labouring still.

**13.** *Rufus*, though his name is common, is supposed to be son of Simon of Cyrene (Mark xv. 21), for St. Mark, who probably wrote at Rome, assumes that Alexander and Rufus are well known.

*chosen in the Lord,*] Rather, **the** *chosen.* The title seems to be added as expressing some special excellence, and not simply that Divine election which is common to all Christians. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 4, Sap. Salom. iii. 14, τῆς πίστεως χάρις ἐκλεκτή, and Baruch iii. 30, Χρυσίου ἐκλεκτοῦ.

*his mother and mine.*] A graceful acknowledgment of maternal love and care bestowed, we know not when, on the Apostle. The father and brother seem to be dead, if this be the Rufus of St. Mark.

**14.** *Asyncritus*, *Phlegon*, and *Hermes*, are wholly unknown, though catalogued by the

Digitized by Google

15 Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which are with them.

16 Salute one another with an holy kiss. The churches of Christ salute you.

17 Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

18 For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their

---

Pseudo-Hippolytus as Bishops of Hyrcania, Marathon, and Dalmatia.

In the same list "*Patrobas*" (or Patrobius) appears as Patrobulus, Bishop of Puteoli: he may have been a dependant of Patrobius, the powerful freedman of Nero, whose death is recorded by Tacitus, Hist. i. 49, ii. 95. (Lightfoot, 'Philippians,' p. 174.)

*Hermas.*] Origen's conjecture on this passage that this Hermas was the author of "The Shepherd" is of no weight against the contemporary evidence of the Muratorian Canon, A.D. 170 circ.: "Hermas composed 'the Shepherd' *very lately in our times* in the city of Rome, while the Bishop Pius his brother sat in the chair of the Roman Church." Compare Westcott on the Canon, pp. 217–220, and Lightfoot, 'Philipp.' p. 167.

*the brethren which are with them*]. Origen suggests on *v.* 15 that these were the household servants of the persons above named. Others, with greater probability, have imagined them to be members of a separate Christian congregation at Rome, similar to those mentioned in *v.* 5 and *v.* 15.

**15.** *Philologus and Julia* were probably man and wife, or possibly brother and sister: a Caius Julius Philologus is mentioned in an inscription (Murat. p. 1586, 3) as freedman of Caius. Thus both names point to a connection with "the household of Cæsar."

On "*Nereus*" and his legendary history see "Dictionary of Bible," and Jer. Taylor, "Marriage Ring," Part I. p. 209.

His sister was probably called Nereis, and a Claudia Nereis is mentioned as a freedwoman of Augustus (Lightfoot).

"*Olympas*" is mentioned in the list of the Pseudo-Hippolytus. See note on *v.* 5.

*Salute one another with an holy kiss.*] The ancient custom of the East, particularly among the Jews, of uniting a greeting with a kiss, became among Christians a holy symbol of loving fellowship in the Lord. (Compare i. 7, note on χάρις.)

In 1 Thess. v. 26, St. Paul requests the leaders of the Church to "*salute all the brethren with a holy kiss*," seemingly in *his* name and as a token of *his* love.

Here and in 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12 "*a kiss of charity*" (1 Pet. v. 14) is to be given and received by each member of the Church in token of *their love to one another*.

This "mystic" (Clem. Al.) or symbolic "kiss of peace" (Tert.), "the Lord's kiss" (Ap. Const. ii. 57) was embodied in the Eucharistic office as early as the time of Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 65 A.D.): it occurred immediately before the oblation of the gifts, and its use is thus defined in the so-called 'Apostolic Constitutions:' "Let the Bishop salute the Church and say, The peace of God be with you all. And let the people answer, And with thy spirit: and let the deacon say to all, Salute ye one another with the holy kiss. And let the clergy salute the Bishop, the men of the laity salute the men, the women the women:" viii. 11.

The custom is retained in the Greek Church.

*The churches.*] "**All**" *the churches*. Compare *v.* 19, and i. 8. The expression need not be limited to the churches visited by St. Paul: he knew the good will of all towards the Romans, and so speaks for all.

17–20. A WARNING AGAINST FALSE TEACHERS.

**17.** *divisions and offences.*] The articles in the Greek imply that "**the divisions and the offences**," which had been caused in other Churches by false teachers, were known to the readers, not necessarily that the same evils were already prevalent among themselves.

The contrary is rather implied by the absence of any such expression as "among you," and by the emphasis on the Pronoun in the clause "*contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned*."

The Apostle fears lest false teachers, such as those who had caused so much trouble elsewhere, might appear at Rome, and so exhorts his readers "*to mark them*," *i.e.* to watch them carefully and keep out of their way.

Bp. Lightfoot, 'Philippians,' iii. 18, thinks that the warning is directed against persons belonging to the same party to which the passages vi. 1–23; xiv. 1—xv. 6, are chiefly addressed. See Introduction, § 8.

**18.** *our Lord Jesus Christ.*] "**Our Lord Christ.**" In "*serve not*," the negative has

Digitized by Google

own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

19 For your obedience is come abroad unto all *men*. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.

[Or, harmless.]

20 And the God of peace shall [1]bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you. Amen.

[1 Or, tread.]

21 Timotheus my workfellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, salute you.

22 I Tertius, who wrote *this* epistle, salute you in the Lord.

---

from its position an emphatic force equivalent to "refuse to serve." The further description of men who serve "*their own belly*," i. e. who give themselves up to sensual indulgence, indicates a class of false teachers like the adversaries of the Apostle at Philippi, "*whose God is their belly*" (Phil. iii. 19).

*by good words and fair speeches.*] Read, "**by their kind and flattering speech,**" or, "by their kind speech and praise." The meaning of χρηστολογία is not disputed: Fritzsche, followed by Meyer, takes εὐλογία in the sense of "eloquence" or "fine expression," as in Plato ('Rep.' iii. 400 D), and Lucian (Alexiphanes i. near the beginning). Fritzsche thinks that St. Paul has used εὐλογία in this unusual sense for the sake of the pointed alliteration and antithesis between χρηστολογία referring to the *contents*, and εὐλογία to the *form* of the discourse.

But two words combined under one Article ought to express cognate ideas, rather than two ideas so distinct as those of "kindness" and "eloquence" (Philippi).

The meaning "praise" (Plato, 'Axiochus' 365, A) is much nearer to the usual Scriptural sense, "blessing:" compare Rev. v. 12. That the "praise" here meant is false and "**flattering**" is implied not in the word, but in the context.

*deceive the hearts of the simple.*] Rather, "**of the innocent**" (All the English versions except Geneva and A.V.). See Prov. xiv. 15. The same word (ἄκακος) is applied in Heb. vii. 26 to Christ, in whom "innocence" is combined with the fulness of wisdom and knowledge: but in others it is often akin to a simplicity which is easily deceived. See Trench, 'N. T. Synonyms,' 2nd Series; and Ruhnken, 'ad Tim.' p. 18.

**19.** The connexion and arguments are made quite clear by the emphatic position of ὑμῶν. "The innocent they deceive, but they ought not to deceive you, who are not mere innocents, for *your* obedience is come abroad unto all men." Compare i. 8.

*I am glad therefore on your behalf.*] Rather, "**Over you therefore I rejoice.**" In the right reading, ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω (Tisch. 8), the position of the pronoun is again emphatic: there is "a delicate combination of *warning* with the expression of firm *confidence*" (Meyer). Only, the *confidence* is expressed first: this is characteristic of St. Paul.

*but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.*] Rather, "**Yet I wish you to be** *wise unto that which is good*, **but pure towards evil.**" On the word ἀκέραιος, "**pure,**" unmixed, unalloyed with evil, see Trench and Ruhnken, as above on *v.* 18; and compare Matt. x. 16; Phil. ii. 15. By the general expression "*wise unto that which is good*" St. Paul means, especially, wise in discerning and adhering to the truth which they had learned.

**20.** Warning is followed by encouragement. They who cause dissension (*v.* 17) are instruments of Satan: "**but** *the God* (who is the author) *of peace shall* **crush** *Satan under your feet shortly.*"

There is an evident allusion to the promise in Gen. iii. 15.

"He says not 'shall subdue,' but '*shall* **crush**,' and not them only but their leader '*Satan*': and not simply '*shall* **crush**,' but '*under your feet*,' so that they gain the victory themselves, and are made illustrious by the trophy. From the time also there is comfort again, for he adds '*shortly*.'" (Chrysost.)

The passage is very similar to the warning in 2 Cor. xi. 12–15 against the Judaizing adversaries, who are described as ministers of Satan.

*The grace.*] The Apostle's concluding benediction is here given in its original form: compare 1 Thess. v. 28, 2 Thess. iii. 18. On the meaning of "*the grace*," see i. 7.

"*Amen*" is not found in the best MSS. On the repetition of the benediction, see Introduction, § 8.

"And thus he brings his discourse becomingly to an end in prayer: '*The grace of our Lord*.' For this he loves ever to make a foundation, this a conclusion." (Chrysost.)

### 21–23. Salutations from St. Paul's Companions.

**21.** Timothy had been with St. Paul in Macedonia in the latter part of A.D. 57 (2 Cor.

Digitized by Google

23 Gaius, mine host, and of the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth you, and Quartus a brother.

24 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you all. Amen.

25 Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my

---

i. 1); whether he had come on with him at once to Corinth is not known. In the opening address (i. 1-7) his name is not associated with St. Paul's as in other Epistles (1 and 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., Philemon). He may therefore have been absent when the Epistle was begun, joining St. Paul just before it was closed, on the eve of his departure for Jerusalem. See Acts xx. 1-4. Timothy was known to some in Rome, at least to Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 1-5).

"*Lucius*" is certainly not St. Luke (Lucas, or Lucanus), but possibly "*Lucius of Cyrene*," Acts xiii. 1.

"*Jason*" is *not improbably* the same who is mentioned in Acts xvii. 5, as his home had been at Thessalonica, though he is not one of the Thessalonians mentioned in Acts xx. 4.

*Sosipater* may be the same as *Sopater* (**son of Pyrrhus**) *of Berœa* (Acts xx. 4). See Paley, 'Horæ Paulinæ.'

*my kinsmen.*] See *vv.* 7, 11.

**22.** "*Tertius*," the amanuensis who had hitherto written from St. Paul's dictation and in his name, is now permitted to send a greeting in his own name. To have sent his greeting in the Third Person would have been to treat him as a mere machine (Godet). We have therefore in this little detail an instance of St. Paul's characteristic courtesy, and at the same time a strong proof of the genuineness of the passage: for what forger would have thought of introducing such an incident? See Lucht, p. 81.

Tertius was a very common Roman name, and he was probably an Italian known to many of the readers.

*in the Lord.*] *I. e.* as your brother in Christ. See 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

**23.** *Gaius.*] *I.e.* Caius. Several persons of this name are mentioned in the N. T.

(*a.*) (1 Cor. i. 14) a member of the Corinthian Church baptized by St. Paul's own hand:

(*b.*) A Macedonian, St. Paul's companion at Ephesus, Acts xix. 29.

(*c.*) A native of Derbe in Lycaonia, who soon after this letter was despatched travelled with St. Paul from Corinth to Asia (Acts xx. 4).

(*d.*) "*The well-beloved*" brother to whom St. John wrote his 3rd Epistle; celebrated for his hospitality to the Church, and probably residing in some city near Ephesus.

These were probably four distinct persons, of whom (*a*) is the one here mentioned: according to a tradition mentioned by Origen, in his note on this passage, he was Bishop of Thessalonica.

*mine host, and of the whole church.*] St. Paul lodged at this time with Caius, as on his first visit to Corinth with Aquila, and afterwards with Justus (Acts xviii. 1-7). Caius seems either to have lent his house for the meetings of the Church, or more probably to have shown a ready hospitality to all who came to visit the Apostle. St. Paul gratefully recognises this by calling him "*my host and*" (in a more general sense) the host "*of the whole church*": compare *v.* 13: "*his mother, and mine.*"

*Erastus the chamberlain of the city.*] Rather, "**the steward**," or "**the treasurer of the city.**" It is hardly probable that the holder of such an office is the same Erastus whom St. Paul sent forward with Timothy into Macedonia before he himself left Ephesus (Acts xix. 22), and the same who is said (2 Tim. iv. 20) to have remained at Corinth.

*Quartus a brother.*] "**Our brother**" (ὁ ἀδελφός), *i.e.* Quartus who is a brother in the Lord: not the brother of Erastus, or Tertius, as some have conjectured.

**24.** On the repetition of the benediction, see Introduction, § 8.

**25-27.** THE DOXOLOGY "rich in contents, and deep in feeling" (Meyer) forms a noble conclusion to this great Epistle. Comparing it with the introduction in c. i. we find in both the same fundamental thoughts of the Epistle: "the power of God unto salvation" (i. 16), the gospel entrusted to St. Paul for the Gentiles (i. 5), the testimony of the Prophets (i. 2), the "obedience to the faith" (i. 5), the acceptance of all nations (i. 5, 14-16), all these thoughts are here gathered up into one harmonious burst of "wonder, love, and praise."

**25.** *Now to him that is of power to stablish you.*] "**Now unto him that is able,**" **&c.**: see Eph. iii. 20, Jude 24.

In i. 11 St. Paul has expressed his great desire to visit them in order that they "*may be established.*" The same feeling which is there implied in the use of the Passive Voice (see note on i. 12) is here distinctly expressed: God alone "**is able** *to stablish you.*"

*according to my gospel.*] Compare ii. 16,

Digitized by Google

gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,

26 But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known

---

and notes there; 1 Tim. i. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 8. The usage of this characteristic phrase, as well as that of the Verb στηρίζειν (for which see the note at the end of the chapter), shows that the sense is *not* "to cause you to remain steadfastly faithful to my gospel" (Meyer), *but*, "*to stablish you*, **in accordance with** *my Gospel*," *i. e.* according to the good tidings which I, the Apostle of the Gentiles, announce to you (i. 11, 13).

"By this expression he wishes to indicate the type of Christian teaching which had been revealed to himself personally (Gal. i. 11-16), and of which the two characteristic features were the perfectly gratuitous, and the absolutely universal character of its salvation" (Godet).

*and the preaching of Jesus Christ.*] Either, "what is preached concerning Jesus Christ," or, "what Jesus Christ preached," *i. e.* through me His Apostle. The latter is favoured by the passages in which κήρυγμα is followed by a Genitive (Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32; 1 Cor. ii. 4, xv. 14), and is explained by Meyer as "a more precise definition proceeding from the humble piety of the Apostle. As he wrote or uttered the words '*my gospel*,' he at once vividly felt that *his gospel* was withal nothing else than *the preaching which Christ Himself caused to go forth* (*through him as His organ*)" ch. xv. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 17. But the other meaning, "what is preached concerning Jesus Christ," is simpler and better suited to the context, which requires that the Gospel should be characterised according to its great subject Jesus Christ (i. 3, ii. 16, x. 8-12; Gal. i. 6-8), and gives no special occasion for such an expression of St. Paul's personal humility as Meyer imagines.

*according to the revelation of the mystery.*] In form and construction this clause exactly corresponds to the preceding, and κατά has the same sense in both: the truth that God "*is able to establish you*" is in accordance with "*my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ*" in accordance with "**a revelation of a mystery.**" For a similar construction of κατά, repeated in co-ordinate clauses, see Col. ii. 8. The two clauses are also most closely connected in sense, as if St. Paul had said, "my gospel. the gospel which I preach concerning Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, is a revelation of a mystery that has been long hidden."

Elsewhere St. Paul tells us how he had received his own knowledge of Christ, namely, "*by revelation*" (Gal. i. 12; cp. Gal. i. 16, 1 Cor. ii. 10), *i. e.* by a Divine enlightenment of his soul proceeding from the Holy Spirit.

But as in i. 17 he has said that in the gospel is revealed the righteousness of God, so here the parallel clause "*according to my gospel*," and the context, especially the latter part of *v.* 26, show that he is speaking of a revelation made to all men in the Gospel.

On the meaning of μυστήριον, see note on xi. 25. Here in the Doxology, as in 1 Cor. ii. 7, the word denotes the divine purpose of salvation, as a secret long kept in silence, but now made known for obedience of faith unto all the Gentiles.

This special application of μυστήριον is quite in accordance with its place in this Epistle, and there is no ground for Lucht's objection that this use of the word is not earlier than the Epistle to the Ephesians. Cp. Ephes. iii. 3-5, 9; Col. i. 26, 27; ii. 2; iv. 3; and the striking phrase in Luke ii. 32, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν.

*which was kept secret.*] *Which hath been* **kept in silence.** The Passive of σιγᾶν is not unusual in classical Greek.

*since the world began.*] Literally, "in times eternal": the Dative being used as in Acts viii. 11; xiii. 20. But the A.V. rightly retains Tyndale's excellent paraphrase, which expresses more correctly the idea of times reaching back to eternity: 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2. These "times" of silence had lasted until the mystery was revealed in the preaching of the Gospel.

**26.** *But now is made manifest.*] "**But is manifested now.**" Cp. Col. i. 26; iv. 4. "The Old Testament is as it were a clock in its silent course: the N.T. is the sound and stroke of the bell" (Bengel).

*and by the scriptures of the prophets.*] "**and by prophetic scriptures.**" The τε is undoubtedly genuine, and connects the two Participles γνωρισθέντος and φανερωθέντος. The mystery or secret was not only brought to light and manifested (φανερωθέντος) "*by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ*" (2 Tim. i. 10), but it was also made generally known and published abroad (γνωρισθέντος), and St. Paul goes on to tell us (1) by what means, (2) at whose command, (3) for what purpose, and (4) to what extent this publication was made.

(1) On the use of "**prophetic scrip-**

Digitized by Google

to all nations for the obedience of faith:

27 To God only wise, *be* glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen.

---

**tures**" in making this mystery known see Luke xxiv. 27; Acts xiii. 23–41; xvii. 2, 11; xxvi. 22, 27; and cp. Rom. i. 2; iii. 21; and the numerous prophecies quoted in the Epistle, especially those which refer to the Gentiles in c. xv.

(2) The clause "*according to the commandment of the everlasting God*" is most appropriate, because none but "The Eternal" could cause the "stewards of his mysteries" to make known that which had been "*kept secret since the world began.*" Cp. 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3.

(3) *for the obedience of faith.*] "**for obedience to faith**": see i. 5 and note.

(4) *made known to all nations.*] "**unto all the nations is made known.**" The knowledge of the mystery is extended unto (εἰς) all the Gentile nations, because they are all included in the blessing of Abraham.

**27.** *To God only wise, be* (**the**) *glory through Jesus Christ.*] On the difficult question of the right reading, construction, and interpretation of the verse, see Introduction, § 8.

The passage as rendered in A.V. presents no difficulty, and the thought that God alone is wise (whatever be its origin in 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25) is here naturally suggested by the context, and by the whole argument of the Epistle, in which the Apostle has been already forced to exclaim in adoring wonder, "*O the depth of the riches* **and** *wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out!*"

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 7, 25.

**7.** Chrysostom holding Ἰουνίαν to be a woman's name, nevertheless thinks that she with Andronicus is here described as an Apostle. Origen says it is possibly meant that they were of the seventy.

Dr. Lightfoot ('Galatians,' p. 93 note) adopts this view as favouring his theory of the extensive meaning of the term "Apostle."

But usage seems to be opposed to it. Thus in Eurip. 'Hippol.' 103, it is said of Aphrodite, *σεμνή γε μέντοι κἀπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς*. Compare Hec. 379, *ἐσθλῶν γενέσθαι δεινὸς χαρακτὴρ κἀπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς*. Psalt. Sal. ii. 6 (ap. Hilgenfeld, 'Messias Judæorum') *ἐν ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*.

In reference to the first passage quoted from Euripides, Godet asks—"But why not translate quite simply, 'illustrious *among* mortals'? And in the same way, and with still stronger reason, here, 'illustrious among those many evangelists, who by their missionary labours in the countries of the East, have merited the name of *Apostles.*'"

M. Godet has missed the point of the quotation: Aphrodite, "illustrious among mortals," was not a mortal herself. In the same way, Andronicus and Junias, "*of note among the Apostles,*" were not Apostles themselves.

**25.** *στηρίζειν.* Of the five other passages in which the word occurs, only two (2 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Peter i. 12) are cited by Meyer in favour of his interpretation, "Cause you to remain stedfastly faithful to my Gospel," and in both these the Preposition connecting *στηρίζειν* with the following words is *ἐν*, not *κατά*. The only remaining examples (Luke ix. 51; xvi. 26; 1 Thess. iii. 13) add nothing to the argument for the closer connection.

The Verb usually stands by itself in the sense of "confirm" or "stablish": see i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 3; also Luke xxii. 32; James v. 8; 1 Peter v. 10; Apoc. iii. 2.

Digitized by Google

# CORINTHIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.

CORINTH, the "Star of Hellas" and the capital of Achaïa, was in 57 A.D. a renowned centre of traffic between Europe and Asia. It was called the "Bridge of the Sea" that united the Morea with the Mainland; it was known as the "Gates of the Peloponnese" that commanded ingress and egress from north and south, imports and exports from east and west. Commercial, and the seat of the Roman proconsulate and of the famous Isthmian games, it was also literary and the resort of sophists. It was likewise luxurious and licentious: Aphrodite had a renowned temple here, to which were attached a thousand priestesses, consecrated courtesans. In fact, the costly voluptuousness of Corinth passed into a proverb, and Menander's line translated by Horace, Non cuivis homini contingit adire Corinthum, is well known. As to its history previous to 57 A.D. it will suffice to notice here that after the battle of Chaeronea 338 B.C. Corinth fell into the hands of Philip. In 243 B.C. the town was freed from its Macedonian garrison by Aratus, who placed it among the cities of the Achæan League. This League ventured into foolhardy conflict with Rome. Mummius defeated the combined forces of Achaïa, and Corinth, as mistress of the League, was levelled with the ground 146 B.C. For a century the city lay in ruins, and then she rose again to be "the Star of Hellas:" for in 46 B.C. reconstituted as the Colonia Julia Corinthus by Julius Cæsar, she resumed her pristine splendour, and was in St. Paul's time the residence of Gallio the Roman proconsul of Achaïa. Achaïa was the southern division of the Roman province of Greece, Macedonia being the northern. St. Paul does not seem to include the whole of Hellas under the name Achaïa.

*State of Corinth* at this time, 57 A.D. The population probably about 400,000. Society of high culture, but in morals lax, even gross. Four classes of inhabitants: (1) Jews, (2) Italian freedmen, (3) Greeks, (4) a motley population from the cities of the Levant.

(1) Here, as in other centres of commerce, there was the usual substratum of Jews. Throughout the Roman province of Achaïa "communities of scattered Israelites" had settled: these were mercantile guilds or firms. How did the Corinthian Jew receive the glad tidings of the Messiah from the lips of St. Paul? His heart hardened against the miracles of our Lord, he was still less impressed by the Apostolic miracles: these carried no conviction to him whatsoever: he demanded *signs from heaven* (1 Cor. i. 22); he reiterated with a new application the Jewish cry of scorn at the foot of the Cross, "If he be the (ascended) Christ, let him now come down!" "*He*, the crucified malefactor, a Messiah meet for our Theocracy!" At such Hebrew sceptics the Apostle in Corinth was compelled (Acts xviii. 6) to "shake out the folds of his cloak." Converts among the Jews were few. Thus the first Epistle speaks to a church in which the Gentile element is much greater than the Jewish; not so other Pauline Epistles.

Digitized by Google

(2) Ἔποικοι or *settlers* of the Julian colony were Italian descendants of the *first* founders from Cæsar's army, and had been now established in Corinth 103 years (B.C. 46 + 57 A.D. = 103). They were termed *Corinthienses*, being *settlers* in Corinth. So *Hispanienses*, *Sicilienses* were settlers in Spain or in Sicily: *Hispani* and *Siculi* being natives. Most of the original settlers were freedmen (1 Cor. vii. 22).

(3) The *Greek* inhabitants of Achaïa were marked by intellectual restlessness and a feverish hankering after novelties. To this was added a ruinous egoism, which three centuries before had prevented Aratus from confederating disintegrated Hellas. Their egoism was as fuel ready laid for the torch of sectarianism. The more cultured of them also had a strong bent for subtle dialectic, which hindered them from seeing "the forest for the trees." A nicely adjusted scheme of philosophy charmed and dazzled: they had no eyes for aught beyond this. How then did the Hellenic student of Aristotle or of Philo receive the preaching of St. Paul? His gaze fixed upon a fleeting wisdom that had no bearing upon man's eternal welfare, he could not see the true wisdom for the false. When the moral logic of the Cross (ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ 1 Cor. i. 18) was set before him, Where is the scheme, he loftily asked, in which this theory of the Cross can be inserted, as a part in the whole? It stands alone, a sun without a system, a thread without its woof: it is foolishness (μωρία).

(4) The *mixed* population of Corinth. These were merchants and sailors from Rome, from Macedonia, from Asia Minor, from Syria and Egypt, traders from the towns of Achaïa, with the usual admixture of handicraftsmen and slaves always found in such a society; to such the simplicity of the Apostle's teaching would be welcome.

The *founding* of the mother Church in Corinth and the *four parties* in it. The Apostle wrought eighteen months there. As to particulars, how St. Paul in 54 A.D. passed from Athens to Corinth and took up his abode there with Aquila the Jew and wrought with him in the same trade of tentmaking, himself "disputing in the synagogue every Sabbath," and how he afterwards dwelt in the house of Justus a proselyte and converted to the faith Crispus the president of the synagogue and many of the Corinthians besides, and how he was encouraged in his work by the Lord speaking to him in a vision by night, and how he was brought by the malicious Jews before the tribunal of Gallio the mild pro-consul of Achaïa, who dismissed the charge,—is all chronicled in the Acts of the Apostles xviii. 1–17.

In his preaching at Corinth St. Paul wielded at first what he calls "the argument of the cross." This argument, his eloquent successor in preaching, Apollos of Alexandria, also employed, but possibly embellished it with Philonian speculations; yet it is probable that the difference between him and St. Paul was only one of outward form and of delivery. Paul planted, Apollos watered: as the first planting, so the after watering, whatever was the diversity between the two teachings, whether in substance of discourse or in manner of treatment. This diversity anyhow led to comparisons and discussions. Discussion bred dissension, dissension partisanship and that vehement, one man crying "I am Pauline;" another, "I belong to Apollos" (1 Cor. i. 12). These were rather cries of individuals than watchwords of hostile parties: they betokened a divided allegiance in some, not an open rent in the Church. The partisans had not become schismatics. This duality of opinion was deepened, after Apollos' departure to Ephesus, by the arrival at Corinth of Judaizing Christians who adopted as a party title the name of Cephas. These men were teachers;

Digitized by Google

and their chief aim being to exalt Peter at the expense of Paul, they were also founders of a third party. They insisted, it appears, not so much on the rite of circumcision, as on legal distinction of meats and the like. They intruded into St. Paul's field of labour, whether opposing his doctrines is not known, but certainly disparaging and invalidating his Apostolic authority, and asserting in its stead the higher claims of St. Peter. They came furnished, it seems, with letters of recommendation from other churches or from individuals. (2 Cor. iii. 1.)

There is reason to think that the Pauline and Apolloite schools differed less from each other than that which called itself by the name of Cephas did from both. About the fourth party much has been written, little is known. Historical materials are lacking. Were they ultra-Petrine followers of Christ in His earthly life, in His fulfilment of Jewish ordinances and of the Mosaic law? The Christ of St. Paul they would probably regard as a transcendental Christ of St. Paul's own imagination. Had they Socinian tendencies? Were they among those who denied the resurrection? Others think that these Christines were quite the reverse of this, ultra-Pauline even, men who refused to "call any one father upon earth," who bowed to the one Headship of Christ in heaven, who repudiated therefore all Apostolic authority. It appears, however, that they appropriated Christ to their own section, excluding the other three from participation in Him. And this from what seems to be the right view of ch. i. 13, "Is Christ divided?" namely, "has the Christ been reduced from a circle to a quadrant? Is He eclipsed in three, shining in one? Is He the Christ of the Christines and not of the Paulines nor of the Petrines? Then Peter must be the Christ of the Petrines and Paul of the Paulines! Was *Paul* crucified for you? Into *Paul's* name were ye baptized? Absurd."

A few words upon the *style* and *tone* and *contents*. In ch. i. a quiet and dignified assertion of his own Apostolic authority, which had been called in question by the Hebraizing party, followed by a courteous salutation, leads to a brief exordium, which is kindly in tone, and winning even. Then the sore subject of partisanship is introduced easily and without obtrusiveness: "I am assured by Chloe's friends that there are contentions among you." After this the style and tone kindle into a fiery vehemence: What? has the Christ been made a *share?* The Christ reduced from a whole to a part? Was then *Paul* crucified for you? was Apollos? was Cephas? Say not that (μή 1 Cor. i. 13). This fiery vehemence rolls on through the first chapter in an emphatic terseness that brings out to the reader's view bright elevations only, leaving dark the connecting depressions. One aim of a commentary is to throw some light, if possible, on the sunken depressions. Again, when he comes to deal with human philosophy, St. Paul speaks out boldly, even contemptuously and in scathing antithesis more than once: "the world's wise are God's fools, and the world's fools are God's wise." Nor can we wonder at this, for it is from the serene summits of his own "superabundant revelations" in the philosophy of Christianity (for he insists that the cross of Christ is the nucleus and centre of a profound philosophy of Redemption planned in heaven prior to Creation itself), it is from this lofty level of a transcendental knowledge that the Apostle looks down with pity and with a holy scorn upon men's intellectual methods and scientific labours to solve life's riddle. Hence with pious contempt he thunders down upon the sophist and the Rabbi, upon the sapient Greek and the stolid Jew, "Where is *wiseman?* where is *scribe?* Has not



Digitized by Google

God proved the world's wisdom *futile?* *silly?* reduced to an absurdity all its irrelevant philosophies?" No compromise here. Or what can be more incisive than the sharp contrasts blended with a polished irony in 1 Cor. i. 27, 28? "A foolish thing of God is wiser than all mankind! A weak thing of God is stronger than all mankind." Or again, "The world's simpletons, the world's nonentities, the world's weaklings and baselings (i. e. elements deemed such by the world) are the *chosen* things, the very elements of God's selection for the kingdom, while the scientists and the potentates and the entities (as St. Paul calls the somebodies) are often, not always, just what God's selective wisdom in its march through the world looks at and passes by and leaves behind. These cosmic eminences are generally among the *rejectanei.*" The above may serve as an imperfect sample of the *style* and *tone*; but on this head it may be further observed that a conspicuous feature in some chapters of this Epistle is the Pauline irony. Certain passages ring with indignant sarcasm; attention will be drawn to this in the commentary.

The *contents* of the Epistle may be briefly combined with the *occasion* of writing it. Three trustworthy members of the Corinthian Church came to Ephesus bearing a letter from the Pauline and largest party, begging a solution of divers questions on marriage, on the veiling of women in assemblies, on sacrificial feasts, on spiritual gifts. The Apostle, who had been informed of the disorders and divisions in the mother church, replies to these questions seriatim. He also rebukes their contentious spirit, their acquiescence in a gross case of immorality unpunished, their appealing to heathen tribunals, their irregularities in the manner of celebrating the Eucharist and the Love-feasts, the denial by some of the resurrection itself.

As the structure of the Epistle is very simple, being based chiefly upon the order in which these several topics are discussed by the Apostle, which order was probably identical with that of the letter of inquiry, there is no need to take a critical survey of the composition as a whole or to subject it to a previous analysis in an Introduction. On this ground, instead of adopting the usual method of setting in the front of the Epistle an elaborate summary of the multifarious contents, it has been thought better to prefix headings to the more important chapters, and to insert here and there brief dissertations on the more difficult questions, as they severally arise, in the commentary itself.

Neither is it at all necessary to repeat the well known arguments by which the authenticity and genuineness of the Epistle have been established and are now universally recognised by competent judges.

*Place* of writing, Ephesus, ch. xvi. 8. *Time*, a little before Pentecost 57 A D.

Digitized by Google

# THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# CORINTHIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

*After his salutation and thanksgiving,* 10 *he exhorteth them to unity, and* 12 *reproveth their dissensions.* 18 *God destroyeth the wisdom of the wise,* 21 *by the foolishness of preaching, and* 26 *calleth not the wise, mighty, and noble, but* 27, 28 *the foolish, weak, and men of no account.*

PAUL, called *to be* an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes *our* brother,

2 Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that [a]are sanctified in Christ Jesus, [b]called *to be* saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both their's and our's:

3 Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.

4 I thank my God always on your

[a] Acts 15. 9.
[b] Rom. 1. 7.

---

CHAP. I. 1–3. APOSTOLIC ADDRESS AND GREETING.

1. *called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ.*] who Himself was the Apostle of his Father. Compare "As my Father *sent* me, even so *send* I you:" ἀπέστειλεν. This call was carried into effect by means of the Father's *will expressed* (θέλημα) and communicated to the Son, from whose lips St. Paul, having fallen into an ecstasy in the temple at Jerusalem, received his Apostolic mission in the words "I to the nations afar shall send thee forth."

*called.*] κλητός, *i.e.* effectually called. *All* men are or will be κεκλημένοι; *they* only who *listen to* the call or invitation to the Messianic kingdom are properly κλητοί. Similarly Clem. Alex. Strom. p. 314, ed. Sylb. οἱ ὑπακούσαντες βουληθέντες κλητοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν. Clearly the 'effectually called' correspond to the men of honest heart, "such as hear the word and receive it," in the parable of the sower. Compare our Lord's saying, "Many are called (to the *kingdom*, which was the substance of His parables), but few are chosen" thereunto.

Sosthenes seems to have been a teacher well known to the Corinthians, who was now with St. Paul at Ephesus, when he wrote this letter just before the Feast of the Passover in 57 A.D. His name is associated to show that he shares, if not in the Epistle, at least in the views and counsels contained therein, and indorses them.

*brother.*] Denotes merely brotherhood in Christ, not fellowship in teaching.

2. *the Church of God.*] Genitive of ownership. This is a theocratic designation; it denotes a Christian community *called out* of heathen nations to be the complement and expansion of the Hebrew theocracy.

*to men sanctified.*] The change from singular to plural brings to view Corinthian Christians as members of the Church Catholic, their number being restricted and their locality defined immediately by what follows, "that which is in Corinth." In brief, "to the Church of God, and more particularly to the Corinthian branch of it."

*sanctified in Christ Jesus.*] Perfect tense: consecrated to God, and continuing in that consecration.

"In Christ Jesus," expanded, means "Converts by baptism brought out of the sphere of the evil world, in which Satan dominates, into the sphere of Christ Jesus and of all the benefits of His Passion, and abiding in that hallowed circle."

*called to be Saints.*] Their call or invitation to the Messianic kingdom, like St. Paul's to the Apostolate, came to them from *God* in Christ Jesus and through the preachers of the Gospel.

*with all that call upon . . .*] Of this controverted passage the following interpretation is suggested. "To the Church of God, that which is in Corinth, together with all who invoke the name of our Lord in every place (in Achaia besides Corinth) *their* Lord as



Digitized by Google

behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ;

5 That in every thing ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and *in* all knowledge;

6 Even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you:

7 So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the [1]coming of our Lord Jesus Christ:

8 Who shall also confirm you unto the end, *that ye may be* blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

9 [c]God *is* faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

[1] Gr. *revelation.*

[c] 1 Thess. 5. 24.

---

much as ours, wheresoever they are, whether in Cenchreæ or in another provincial church." For other views of this verse see additional note at the end of this chapter.

**4-9.** This preamble has a winning and conciliatory tone. The "grace of God" which had been bestowed upon them is in its effects further specified in ver. 5. "In Christ Jesus"—this grace was given by God, and given in Christ as the only sphere of its manifestation, not in the outlying sphere of the world or *cosmos.*

**5.** "That you, namely, were *in every way* enriched *in* Him, in all skill of discourse or argument, and in all kind of intelligence," the inward endowment of Christian intelligence finding expression in readiness of logical utterance.

**6.** "According as," just in the degree in which the testimony of Christ, i.e. the Gospel preached, was established firm and sure in you, in your hearts by faith.

**7.** "**Causing you not to feel behindhand** not to be conscious of any backwardness (lagging behind other churches) in any gift of grace bestowed." Surely the usual rendering, "*so that* ye fall behind in no gift" would require very different Greek. Even Meyer falls into the common error. The middle voice here denotes subjectivity, and implies a *consciousness* of lagging behind.

"Gift of grace" here means all spiritual blessings, not to the exclusion of the extraordinary gifts, that of tongues, for instance; though perhaps the idea of *ethical* endowments predominates, because of the definitive participial clause that follows, denoting an *attitude* of earnest expectation, an attitude resulting from a high moral tone. Sense of this definitive clause is, "awaiting, as you are," i.e. in full, "looking *away* from all else and looking *out* for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ;" name and titles at full length, as in ver. 2, denoting the majesty of the unveiled Presence. Comp. for thought Phil. iii. 20, "Out of which heaven we do look for the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall transfigure the body of our humiliation unto conformity with the body of His glory."

**8.** *Who also*] i.e. on His part, in a manner corresponding to your expectation, "will keep you stedfast unto the end;" the end, i.e. not of life, but of this Aeon or Dispensation. How the mind of St. Paul seems to us of the present day to glance across the wide gulf of centuries, which we now know was destined to intervene between the deaths of men and the Advent of their Lord! Clearly among the Apostle's superabundant revelations the day of the Advent was not one. He himself in 2 Cor. v. seems rather to expect that he shall not *put off* his mortal body, but *put on over* it the new body spiritual, and that he shall be found "not naked" at the Parousia.

"Shall keep you stedfast unto the end" of this Aeon "so as to be unimpeached in the day of our Lord;" for when the saints stand before the tribunal of Christ, they will not indeed be found to have been free from sin in their earthly life, but having persevered in the faith and in good works will find themselves under the wing and shelter of God's righteousness, safe from all impeachment. For "blameless," A.V. which does not truly represent the Greek read "**unimpeached.**" Unimpeached of whom? Probably of the "accuser of the brethren," the adversary Satan. But being found holy in Christ and blameless to God, "who shall then lay an impeachment against God's elect? It is God that justifieth." For this view of unimpeachedness conditioned by continuance in the faith, see Col. i. 28: "To present you holy and without blemish (sacrificial term) and unimpeached before him, of course *if* (εἴ γε) ye persevere in the faith. . . ."

**9.** Ground stated of this hope of their establishment in the faith. "Were the establishing on the part of Christ not to take place, God's call unto fellowship with His Son would remain without effect, which would not be compatible with the *faithfulness* of Him from whom the call comes and who by His calling gives pledge to us of eternal salvation" (Rom. viii. 30).—Meyer.

As the calling of God is a calling to the Messianic Kingdom, "fellowship with His Son" must here denote association with him in the glory; for set in that glory the children of God (Rom. viii. 21) are also to be partakers with Him, the Head, in the inheritance and in the

Digitized by Google

10 Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and *that* there be no [1]divisions among you; but *that* ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.

[1] Gr. *schisms.*

11 For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them *which are of the house* of Chloe, that there are contentions among you.

---

kingship and in the priesthood, and likewise assessors to Him in the judgment of the *cosmos*, as appears from the right view of (Matt. xxv.) "inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the *least* of *these* my *brethren*, ye did it unto me;" where *these* seems to indicate membership in the same brotherhood to which the assessors belong; but what does the word *least* denote? Probably the lowest order or rank in the moral scale.

**10.** The word "brethren" is a form of address at once affectionate and earnest, drawing special attention to the purport of the exhortation; see x. 1; xiv. 20. The exhortation itself is ushered in through the great Name, here expressed in full, not merely to make the appeal more solemn, but because the very mention of that Name in the outset closely bears upon the argument in ver. 13, by which the Apostle seeks to dissuade from party-spirit. For the invocation of it would serve to remind the Corinthians—(1) that into the name of Jesus Christ and into none other, whether of Paul or of Apollos or of Cephas, they had been baptized; and (2) that the same Jesus Christ here designated "our *Lord*" was *their* Lord and the "Lord of all" without an equal and without a rival, whether it be Paul or Apollos or Cephas. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 5. "For we (Apostles) preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as *Lord*." But for the special bearing of the designation "our Lord" upon what follows, see the explanation below of the text, "Is Christ divided?"

*that ye* . . .] The conjunction *that* here denotes *purport* (not design mingled with purport, as some think), because it ushers in the sentence which contains the purport or substance of the exhortation. One instance of this definitive use of *that* will suffice, "Command that these stones become loaves." Here the conjunction simply *defines* the substance of the command, viz. the conversion of the stones into loaves.

*that ye speak the same thing* . . .] i.e. that ye make the same profession all of you (a prospective glance at the distinctive party declarations, "I am of Paul, I am of Apollos") and that there be no divisions among you, but rather ye be nicely adjusted or readjusted (2 Cor. xiii. 17) in the same mind and in the same view. Oneness of view and of purpose, leading to oneness of declaration is the deeper element in which the readjustment and reunion of parties is to take place. See 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

It is clear from this passage, viewed in the light of ver. 12, "Every one of you *saith*, I am of Paul," &c., that the term "divisions" signifies not *schisms*, as in the marginal rendering, but *dissensions*, not separations from the Church, but dissensions within the Church. This appears (1) from the phrase "among you," i.e. within the circle of your community twice occurring (vers. 10, 11); and (2) from the light thrown upon the meaning of the term translated "divisions" or "schisms," by ver. 12.

"*Every one* of you (as the representative of a party) *saith*. . . ." From the two considerations stated above it seems certain that the "divisions," so far from having proceeded to the length of separation from the Church, had not as yet become organized schools or sects within its pale. They had not yet passed the limits of party opinions expressed by individuals in speech. Precisely the same sense attaches to the word in John vii. 43; ix. 16; x. 19. In the last cited verse we read, "There was a *division* again among the Jews, and many of them *said* . . . others *said*," i.e. a dissension or difference of opinion expressed in words.

**11.** Sets forth the ground of the previous exhortation. What people of Chloe are meant (sons? brothers? household people?) was as well known to the readers, as it is unknown to us. Chloe is usually considered a Corinthian Christian, whose people had come to Ephesus; but it is more in harmony with St. Paul's discretion to suppose that she was an *Ephesian* known to the Corinthians, whose people had been in Corinth and returned to Ephesus.

The word "contentions" supports the modified sense already assigned to the term "divisions." If it should be objected that the Apostle may have employed a stronger phrase in his exhortation than in the statement of his motive to that exhortation, it may be answered (1) that it is not consistent with St. Paul's "charity which hopeth all things" to represent what is bad as likely to become worse: and (2) that in ver. 10 the sense of the Greek is not 'I exhort that there *arise* no divisions or schisms' (which

Digitized by Google

12 Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of [d]Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.

[d] Acts 18. 24.

13 Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?

14 I thank God that I baptized

---

would have been the correct form of expression, had "divisions" denoted a greater evil than "contentions"), but, 'I exhort that divisions among you cease to exist.'

**12.** A specification of the previous general statement, also grounded on the declaration of the people of Chloe.

"What I mean is this: that each one of you (in his own party) saith, I am," &c. Here we have four apparently co-ordinate parties, not yet developed into four organized sectarian systems; not as four insulated mountains standing asunder, but as one mountain with four summits parted from each other by shallow depressions. These shallow valleys may, by a convulsion, be torn into deep gorges reaching even to the base, or they may be exalted to a level with the summits, and so an even oneness be achieved.

It is probable that all the four parties (their respective Heads, of course, not included) fall alike under the Apostle's censure: even the last-mentioned one, not because it appropriated Christ as its Leader, but because it did so to the exclusion of the other three from participation in Him. (See 2 Cor. x. 7.)

**13.** The acknowledged difficulty of this text lies not merely in the translation of the verb here rendered "is divided," but still more in the connexion of the clause with the clauses immediately preceding and following. One thing seems certain. that the name of Christ is here applied to Him as to a Person, and is not used in the mystical sense. For the name of Christ in the preceding sentence is plainly used of the Person, as are those of Paul and Apollos and Cephas. And so the mystical meaning of the same name in the very next sentence would obviously import a new and totally foreign element of thought. Besides, in this whole section of the 1st chapter, what mention, what stray intimation, of this idea occurs? None whatsoever. If, therefore, the Person of Christ is here introduced, the question is, how are we to explain the verb "is divided?" The personal distribution of the Saviour through the four sects is inexplicable, as the last-named of the four professes to belong to Christ himself in His integral oneness. It is also incompatible with the strict logical connexion which must exist between the first question and the second and third questions of ver. 13. For the second and third are evidently deductions from the first.

I propose to translate, "Is *the* Christ made a share?" By the word *share* is meant not simply a part, but a part of a whole viewed in relation to the other complementary part or parts. For instance, "Abraham shared a tenth—i. e. made a tenth part of all the spoils as a share to Melchisedec" (Hebr. vii. 2). Here the share of a tenth implies a relation to the whole and to the other not co-equal but co-ordinate share of nine-tenths reserved to Abraham.

Assuming this to be the right translation, the logical connexion will be this:—

"Is the Christ made a *share?*" Is He not a whole, but a part or share co-ordinate with three others? Is He no longer the complete Circle, around which is assembled in its oneness the Corinthian Church, regarding Him from all sides as the One Saviour? but is He reduced to a single quadrant of that circle, the other three quadrants being Paul and Apollos and Cephas? If this be true, the startling inference is that Christ being a Saviour to His own, the other three leaders are co-ordinate saviours, each to his own adherents; and so I ask you, while I shrink from the thought (such is the force of the Greek), Was *Paul* [to take as an instance the first-named of the three heads] *crucified* for you? Or were ye *baptized* into the name of *Paul?* And yet this is the conclusion, absurd as it is monstrous, nay, blasphemous, to which you are drifting on the waves of party opinions and party professions. Wherefore, I beseech you, brethren, by that Name, which is above every name, the name of Him who is our *Lord*, who is *the Christ*, the One Saviour to all, that divisions die among you and that union and harmony revive in the pure atmosphere of sameness of view and of purpose, leading to sameness of confession.

The term "is divided" admits also of another translation, slightly diverging from the one given above, but finally converging with it into the same logical connexion. It is this: 'Apportioned is Christ?' Assigned as a portion is He? The word portion here denotes relation rather to its own *claimant* or *appropriator* than to other co-ordinate parts. The claimant of Christ as its own portion exclusively is in this instance, of course, the last-named party of Christ. If this be the more correct rendering, an under-link of connexion between 'Apportioned is Christ?' and 'Was Paul crucified for you?' must be mentally supplied; an intermediate

Digitized by Google

[e] Acts 18. 8.

none of you, but [e] Crispus and Gaius;

15 Lest any one should say that I had baptized in mine own name.

16 And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

17 For Christ sent me not to

---

flash of thought so obvious that time would have been wasted in wording it. This silent link is expressed by the clause in italics: If the Christ, the One Saviour, has become the heritage of one party, *what is to become of the salvation of the other three?* Was Paul crucified for you? Or . . . .

**14, 15.** Many explain these verses thus, or nearly thus: the Apostle does not say, I rejoice that I baptized few of you, and so no one can say that in my own name I baptized. He looks above and beyond the nearest causes of events, and says, I am thankful to God who, in order to prevent any one from asserting that I had baptized in my own name, designedly brought about the fact of my having baptized very few in Corinth.

The above explanation seems to be open to one grave objection. For it does not appear that the idea of "having been baptized in the name of Paul" had ever occurred, or was likely to occur, to any of St. Paul's adherents. It is not, like the statements, "I am of Paul," &c., *cited* as a party declaration that had reached the Apostle's ears through the people of Chloe. The notion is now broached for the first time. It has its origin in the Apostle's mind, and is simply a logical weapon employed by him to convince the Corinthians of the extreme perils of sectarianism. It is in a serious *reductio ad absurdum* argument intended to refute an inference drawn from an inference. Thus: "Is the Christ become a co-ordinate share or an exclusive portion?" If you admit this fearful deduction which follows from your party professions, you must also admit another monstrous deduction, that you were baptized in the name of a crucified Paul. But I thank God that I can refute this last conclusion by the fact evolved in His Providence of my having baptized very few.

If this explanation be right, is it likely that the Apostle should not merely ascribe to God's Providence the fact of few baptisms, but should also assign as the Divine motive of that fact the prevention of an opinion which probably would never find utterance?

Therefore render thus: **I am thankful to God** for the fact **that no one did I baptize save Crispus and Gaius** (a fact requiring) **that no one should say, &c.** The conjunction *that* will thus denote, not purpose or design on the part of God, but a result viewed as *possible* by St. Paul—not an actual result, an idea which does not lie in the original.

Out of many passages substantiating this use of *that* may be cited—(1) John ix. 1. "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, *that* he *should be* born blind?" This surely is the right rendering of the last clause, and the full expansion of the whole is, "Did this man or his parents commit sin" (a condition requiring some form of punishment and in this instance), "that he should be born blind?" (2) Rom. xi. 11. "Did they stumble, that they should fall?" i. e. Did they so far stumble that their final fall is a probable or possible result?

If the ellipse in this explanation of the use of *that* be objected to, the answer is: (1) The nature of language, especially in conversation and in epistles, is highly elliptical, and the reasons are obvious. (2) The same objection lies against the first interpretation, because in that an ellipse must be supplied, "Who (God) has brought this to pass with the intent that none may say."

**16.** How the precise mention of these three names brings out the conscientiousness of St. Paul!

**17.** No depreciation here of Baptism. The Apostle has already (ver. 13) made honourable mention of this sacrament by connecting it with the Crucifixion itself, clearly as the means and seal of admission to all the benefits of Christ's Passion. That St. Paul had an Apostle's authority to baptize, and that he made a discretionary use of it, is plain from his own statement that he did baptize Crispus and Gaïus and Stephanas. But his meaning in this verse is, that to preach the Gospel was his special mission from Christ, a mission not excluding him from baptizing in his own person whenever he thought fit. The original brings out this idea more clearly, "For Christ did *not* send me to baptize, but (sent me) to preach."

"*Not in wisdom of speech.*" *Speech* here, as generally explained, means mode or style of preaching. The Cross of Christ was not to be presented in a philosophic dress, such as was pleasing to Hellenic taste, lest the pure substance should be missed in the attractiveness of the form. The doctrine of Christ crucified was the pure substance of Apostolic preaching, and so proclaimed simply, without the alloy of human wisdom, had the peculiar force of reducing to nothing, in the eyes of believers, all human wisdom. Hence

Digitized by Google

baptize, but to preach the gospel: *f* not with wisdom of ‖words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.

*f* 2 Pet. 1 16. ‖ Or, *speech.*

18 For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the *g* power of God.

*g* Rom. 1. 16.

19 For it is written, *h* I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.

*h* Is. 29. 14.

20 *i* Where *is* the wise? where *is* the scribe? where *is* the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

*i* Is. 33. 18.

---

if to believers the Cross had been preached in philosophic guise, it would have lost its power, as seeming to make common cause with human wisdom, either by descending to its level or by exalting instead of depressing it.

But the above explanation, though good in itself, does not quite satisfy the original, in which the terms "speech" ver. 17 and "word" ver. 18 are translated from the same Greek term, and the Apostle seems in v. 18 to repeat this term with emphasis, using it in the same *sense*, but with a special determination. The nearest word in English which meets the sense in both passages is, perhaps, *argument.* And this meaning, while it adds keenness and point to ver. 18, also brings out in stronger relief the moral antagonism between human philosophy and the cross of Christ. This word *argument* also suits exactly the original in c. ii. 13. The sense of the verse, then, will be 'Not with philosophy of argument, that the cross of Christ may not thereby be drained of its power, be rendered barren (to believers). **For**—to prove that such a failure must result from such a method of preaching —**the argument of the Cross** (this by itself without any philosophy of argument, which would only mar it), **while it is to the perishing foolishness, is to the being saved** (the medium or organ of) **God's power.**'

Further expansion of the above. The form of the phrase in the Greek is twofold, not simple, thus: 'the argument which consists of the Cross.' The *fact of the Cross* is itself the grand argument, which the Apostles were to wield. Compare "We preach Christ crucified," which means not 'we preach about the crucified One' as the centre of a system, but 'we simply proclaim Christ, and Him too—under what aspect? As seated in glory? Nay, but as hanging on the Cross · this is the fact, and the fact is the logic.'

This plain argument, standing alone and unconnected, is that through which God's power operates unto salvation to all believers. It is a moral argument, appealing to faith, which is itself a moral act and habit; and therefore cannot, as a link in a chain, as a sun in a system, be logically inserted in a speculative scheme of reasoning, which appeals to the pure intellect. Represented thus, as a constituent thread in a well-woven web of philosophy, it would be out of place; it would appear to the perishing as folly set in wisdom and to the believing as wisdom set in folly.

**18.** Latter part. To those who were perishing, the Cross of Christ, proclaimed as a fact, was no more than a fact. To such as were (for) being saved, it was a fact with an application, and that application was wrought by the power of God. St. Paul here describes two sections of mankind. The same naked Cross is presented to all; but while it is a pillar of cloud to some, to others it is a pillar of light. The difference lies in the moral receptivity. "To those *to* whom (not *from* whom) the Gospel is hid" (2 Cor. iv. 3) the veil lies not upon the Gospel, but upon their hearts. The Light to them is darkness, because of their own blindness. So in the natural world, the same heat scorches this plant and cherishes that: it is the same sun at which the owl blinks and the eagle gazes. According to this view, the *state* here described as leading to perdition will be the *cause* of the rejection of the Cross, while perdition itself will be the effect. "If my Gospel is hid," is the mournful conclusion of St. Paul (2 Cor. iv. 3), "it is hid to those who are being lost" (who are on the highway to ruin).

**19.** Scriptural ground for the statements of vers. 17, 18. It was prophesied that all human philosophy of argument, which has been declared to be detrimental to the simple argument of the Cross, should be brought to nought.

The passage (Isaiah xxix. 14, given nearly according to LXX) St. Paul regards according to the typical purport, which accompanies the historical sense, as a prophecy referring to the powerful working of the doctrine of the Cross, that doctrine by which God will drain all human wisdom of its validity. The justification of this way of regarding such passages lay in the Messianic character of O. T. prophecy in general, according to which the historic sense of the utterances does not exclude the purpose of prophecy; but leaves typical references open, which declare themselves historically by some corresponding

Digitized by Google

[k] Rom. i. 20.

21 [k]For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

---

Messianic fact, and hence are recognised afterwards from the point of view of historic fulfilment.—Meyer.

**20.** We now see this prophecy fulfilled; for "where is **wiseman?**" The absence of the article points to the utter sweeping away of the wiseman as such from the circle of God's wisdom of the Cross. He has no place within that circle. So in Pilate's question, "What is truth?" the same absence of the article expresses a scoff, 'There is no such thing as truth.'

The ground is cut away from all wisemen, from all Jewish scribes and Gentile disputers of this world. It is plain that the term "wiseman" comprehends the two classes of Scribes versed in Rabbinical lore, and of Greek sophists absorbed in speculative discussions. The phrase "of this world," belongs to all three terms, "wiseman," "scribe," "disputer," and denotes that age or æon with its pervading tone and spirit which preceded Christianity, in contrast with the world which was to come or the kingdom of the Messiah. To this latter world the wiseman, as such, did not belong.

**20.** Latter clause. "**Did not God prove foolish** the wisdom of this world?" How and when and why He proved it foolish, is declared in ver. 21; the *when* and the *why* are expressed in the first clause, the *how* in the second, viz. by His deciding to employ, as the means of salvation, the opposite of the world's wisdom, i. e. the folly, in the world's view, of the Gospel.

**21.** "For since in the wisdom of God the world **did not get to know God through its wisdom** (of Jewish and Gentile schools of speculation), God **thought it good** by the so-called folly of *the preachment* (of *the Cross simply proclaimed as a fact*, not nicely adjusted in a Rabbinical or philosophic system) to save them that believe." "By the folly of the preachment" may also be rendered "by the preachment of the folly." The Greek is flexible to either. The sense remains much the same. Both "the folly" and "the preachment" are emphatic, but "the folly" more so: "by the folly's preachment." This latter rendering may perhaps harmonize better with "we preach" in ver. 22, which verse contains the proof of God's decision in ver. 21.

In this verse, *the world* includes or denotes both the wisemen, whether Jewish Rabbis or Greek sophists, and their followers, whether Jew or Greek. It stands in precise contrast to *them that believe;* and this new class consisting of believers, taken out of the world of Jews and Greeks, comprises likewise both the preachers of the Gospel and their disciples, the Apostles and their converts. Hence it follows that the phrase *by its wisdom*, meaning "by the speculations of its wisemen, as by them elaborately propounded to their hearers, Jews or Greeks," stands in precise contrast to the more expanded phrase *by the folly of the preachment*, i. e. "by the world's folly of the Cross plainly proclaimed by the Apostles to such as receive it *thus proclaimed*."

Of this difficult verse, the most difficult clause is "in the wisdom of God." It apparently means "as a part of the wise arrangement of God."

It is part of God's wise providence that He will not be apprehended by intellectual speculation, by "dry light." The world tried to know Him in this way: it took a method which the All-wise God repudiated, and so came to the inevitable result—failure. When (and because) the world came to this helpless issue by intellectual systems, God thought good to exhibit the futility of such wisdom, in offering salvation by a new system, of which *the substance* was what the world could not but consider folly, as compared with the substance of its own philosophy; and of which *the form* was mere preachment, proclamation, assertion of facts, as opposed to subtle argumentation, and of which the *causa apprehendens* was not pure intellect, but faith, which is an act or habit of *head* and *heart* combined, and more of heart than of head.

God in His wisdom and mercy allowed intellectual speculation to prove by experience its own barrenness, and so to serve as a kind of schoolmaster to bring the world to Christ. As a matter of fact, there was in the bosom of Greek and Roman philosophy a consciousness of its own impotency, a sense that it had achieved no theological truth, theoretical or practical. It was confessed at Athens on altars "to the unknown God," and in Pilate's desponding and contemptuous question "What is truth?" God designed that this conclusion should be wrought out, and when it had been so, He then exhibited the folly of the method pursued, by offering salvation in the scheme of the Cross. The moment of a man's humiliating conviction that he has failed to attain a great object by a mistaken line of action, is precisely that in which he is most likely to adopt a new method, if proposed to him. "Man's extremity is God's opportunity." Hence the fitness of the season at which St. Paul said to

Digitized by Google

l Matt. 12. 38.

22 For the l Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom:

23 But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness;

24 But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the

---

the Athenians, "Whom, *not knowing*, ye worship, him I declare unto you." So here, "Whom by your wisdom ye have not come to know, him we preach unto you." At a similar moment our Lord mentioned truth to Pilate.

Chrysostom and others of the older commentators interpret thus: "For since the world through the medium of its wisdom, came not to know God *in* His (manifested) wisdom:" i.e. failed to read aright and apprehend Him in the twofold page of His wisdom, which lay open before the world, legible to the Heathen in the book of creation and to the Jews in the writings of the O. T. In this, His manifested wisdom, they might and should have got to know God; but they failed to achieve that end by means of their wisdom; therefore, God thought it good to save believers by the opposite of the world's wisdom, viz., by the (reputed) folly of the Gospel. For the construction "failed to know God *in* His manifested wisdom," compare Luke xxiv. 35: "How He became *known* to them *in* the breaking of the bread." And for the phrase "wisdom" so used, as here, compare the "Wisdom of Solomon," i.e. the Book in which his wisdom is set forth.

**22, 23** contain a twofold proof of the twofold statement of ver. 21. The first member of this sentence substantiates the proposition of the first member of the preceding sentence, and the second that of the second. Protasis confirms protasis, and apodosis apodosis. Thus: Is it true that the world did not ultimately come to know God by its wisdom? Yes, for behold the present state of the world: the Jews ask for an accrediting sign from heaven, and the Greeks look for a well-argued system of philosophy. Is it also true that God therefore determined by the folly of the Cross, simply proclaimed, to save them that believe? Yes; for although the Jews and the Greeks alike so little know God as to ask for a sign and to look for wisdom, yet we Apostles, God's ambassadors (2 Cor. v. 20), merely proclaim Christ—under what aspect?—as nailed to that Cross.

The word *signs* (which is the better reading) clearly excludes the miracles of the Apostles: for the Apostles did work miracles (Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 12), and therefore the Jews could not ask for such signs. It also as clearly excludes the miracles of our Lord's life, for the fact of the crucifixion had drained them of all their power of proof to the Jews: "Others he saved; himself he cannot save" (Matt. xxvii. 42). The word must therefore denote some extraordinary sign or signs from heaven, at once attesting and accrediting the Messiahship of Jesus. (See Matt. xii. 38; xxvii. 42). As the Pharisees demanded from Christ, when He had intimated to them that His miracles were wrought by the Holy Ghost, some transcendent proof of this by a sign, not from Himself, but from Heaven, and as the chief priests standing before the Cross asked Him who was fastened to it to come down from that Cross, that they might believe in Him, so afterwards they demanded from the Apostles some such sign, whether a voice from heaven confirming or the risen Christ himself appearing. They said, Let Him now come down from heaven, if he be the risen Christ.

**23.** The terms "stumbling-block" and "folly" specify the general term "*the folly* of the preachment" in ver. 21.

To the Jews, whom the glosses of their Rabbis on Scripture had led to expect a Messiah seated in power, a Messiah hanging helpless on the cross of shame and the tree of the curse was an utter offence and aversion, while to the Greeks, who thought that a man's moral and intellectual needs could be satisfied only by a system of philosophy, it was an absurdity to announce a *person*, and that person *as* one who had been condemned to die the most ignominious of deaths.

**24.** *But to the called themselves.*] i.e. to the inner circle of *such as obey the call* (such is the import of the Greek word) in opposition to the outer world-circle of unbelievers, who also are *called* but being prepossessed with the "love of darkness" will not hear the divine voice—we preach "Christ as God's power and God's wisdom"—the power of God to the feeble, the wisdom of God to the ignorant.

Two great evils consequent upon the fall are weakness and ignorance. Nothing is more worthy therefore of divine benevolence and wisdom than to allow that one race (the Jews) should discover the helplessness of man, and another (the Greeks) his ignorance. The Jew went upon the first of these searches. He asked for a manifestation of power. He had no conception of philosophy, of principles, of general laws. He looked for the finger, the hand, the arm of the Almighty. The Greek went upon the second search.

Digitized by Google

power of God, and the wisdom of God.

25 Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

26 For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, *are called*:

27 But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;

---

He endeavoured to explain phenomena by philosophic theory. The intended result of the Mosaic Law was—'the things which I would do, I cannot do.' The result of Greek philosophy was—'the things which I would know, I cannot discover.' Christ satisfied both these wants, thus experimentally realised; and though the ignominy of the crucifixion made Him to the unbelieving Jew a stumbling-block and to the unbelieving Greek an absurdity, yet He was to the believing Jew God's power and to the believing Greek God's wisdom. And more than this, He was both to both: for by sending His Son into the world God purposed to furnish the believing Jew, not only with the strength which he craved, but with wisdom also, and the believing Greek, not only with wisdom which he craved, but with strength also, to satisfy in each case, not merely a want felt, but also a want equally real, although unfelt. Thus God, while He allowed men to discover only half their misery, enabled them in His bounty to realise their whole happiness.

**25.** Connexion with the foregoing, We proclaim Christ to be God's wisdom, seeing that "a foolish thing" that comes from God is wiser than men, and we preach Christ as God's power, seeing that a weak thing from God is stronger than man. Here "a foolish thing" and "a weak thing" are general terms comprising the special "death of Christ on the cross," which is the foolish thing to the Greek and the weak thing to the Jew.

*wiser than men.*] Is not an abbreviated mode of comparison equivalent to wiser than all human philosophies: rather it means that men altogether profess less wisdom than is contained in that one foolish thing of God, the Passion of the Crucified. Both *God* and *men* are emphatic words, and in strong contrast.

**26.** Connexion: for, if it were not true that this foolish thing of God is wiser than men, God would never have chosen out of the world the world's fools to shame the world's wisemen; rather He would have selected the wisemen to receive His divine philosophy, if their human philosophies had been at all in keeping with it. But He did nothing of the kind: He selected, as more likely to accept His wisdom, the reputed fools: "**for consider, brethren, as to your calling** (to the kingdom) **that not many** (among you called) **are wise according to the flesh,**" i.e. wise as viewed within the carnal horizon, or judged by the standard of the Old Man, wise in human philosophy. It is simpler, as in the above explanation, to take τὴν κλῆσιν as an accusative of respect or reference and the ὅτι clause as the nearer object of βλέπετε.

**27.** "Not so, but the *fools*, **the simpletons of the world did God choose;**" (τα μωρὰ, neuter plural with a light accent of contempt). Perhaps "simpletons" may give the true idea, just as τὰ μὴ ὄντα, "things that are not," may be rendered *nonentities* rather than *nobodies*, which would require τὰ μηδὲν ὄντα. Of course "simpletons of the world" means persons that are such in the world's estimation, being unphilosophical. In many instances God's wise ones are the world's fools, and the world's wisemen are God's fools. So of *nonentities*. So likewise "the base things" A.V. in the Greek means "things of *no birth*," as we say, i.e. of no birth subjectively, for all men are born objectively. Compare "*nullis* majoribus ortus." Observe that the word 'calling' here has nothing whatever to do with a man's vocation or status in life: it means purely the call or invitation to the Messiah's Kingdom.

The word 'that' ἵνα in vers. 27 and 28, does not denote *design* on God's part in putting to shame the wisemen and in bringing to nought the mighty, but a contemplated necessary and negative result of the design itself, which design was the selection of the fittest for the kingdom and the fittest would be mostly found among the unpreoccupied by the world's wisdom. The A.V. rendering, that he *might* confound the wise, is much too strong: the sense is "*to put to shame* the *wisemen*," masc., in polite contrast to *simpletons*, neut. The abashment of the philosophers is the dark side, inseparable from the bright side of the divine selection. In vers. 27 and 28 the *aorist* "chose out of mankind," thrice repeated with an emphasis of triumph, points to the remote time of God's election in heaven long before His abstract scheme of wisdom took concrete form in the Incarnate Son. Or it may refer to the time of St. Paul's planting the church, as each convert obeyed the call of election. One of

Digitized by Google

28 And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, *yea*, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are :

29 That no flesh should glory in his presence.

30 But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us

---

these two, not both. In favour of the latter is the fact that the Apostle in these verses appeals to their inner consciousness, "consider as to your calling that . . ."

**29.** Immediate aim of the divine selection: "**that no flesh at all may . . .**" The drift is; 'God out of the world *chose* the (so-called) simpletons so as to bring to shame the (so-called) wisemen; *chose* the weaklings so as to bring to shame the mightinesses; *chose* the base-born and the outcasts of society, the nonentities, so as to reduce to nought the entities: wherefore? in order that no *flesh* at all may boast itself in the presence of *God*.' *Flesh* indicates the human element as opposed to the divine principle.

The argument then is, that divine selection of grace and human glorying in self exclude each other. Clearly " in order that " merely designates the immediate aim of the divine selection, not the ultimate end of the divine counsel, which is the redemption and glorification of man. Yet there is such a thing as proper boasting: for although the immediate aim of the divine selection is to shut out from all *flesh* all boasting in the presence of God, nevertheless, " let him who glorieth glory in the Lord," i.e. God from whom came the true Wisdom Jesus Christ; let no one parade his own fleshly wisdom before God, who is the sole author of the true Wisdom from heaven.

**30.** The precise logical connexion of this verse with the preceding ones is not obvious: the *but* (δέ) presents a difficulty. The connexion of the whole seems to be, 'God chose out of your community the (reputed) simpletons, so as to bring to shame the wisemen; He chose the weaklings, so as to bring to shame the mighty ones; He chose the base-born and the outcasts of society, the nonentities, so as to reduce to nought the entities, in order that no flesh at all may make a boast (of its wisdom, &c.) before *God;* but rather it is of Him that *you* are in Christ Jesus, who *became* wisdom *to* you *from* God, in order that whoso among you is for glorying, may ever glory in the Lord.' Literally, the last clause means, " that, as it is written, Let him who . . . ." Supply γένηται after ἵνα.

The fuller sense of the above interpretation will be: All worldly elements of wisdom and of power are simply slighted by God in His application of His own wisdom to man and of His own power. In the march through the world of His selective wisdom, human philosophies are treated as irrelevant absurdities; like dust in a highway under chariot-wheels, they are just passed through and brushed aside and left behind, raising a cloud that soon subsides. This negative contempt and silent " shame " is put upon these worldly elements, in order that *no flesh* (the human element alien to the divine principle) may make boast of its futile wisdom before *Him* who is the sole Source and Author of the true wisdom as embodied in Jesus Christ; *but* rather *that* all believers, if they must glory, may ever glory in the Lord and in *His* wisdom. Clearly, in ver. 31, in contrast to the unregenerate *flesh* of ver. 29, the *homo* redeemed comes to view, and that too glorying in his Redeemer.

Ver. 30, viewed apart from its connexion, is a great text, and great in the greatness of the mystery. " Who *became* wisdom *to* us (σοφία ἡμῖν not ἡμῖν σοφία) *from* God." *Became*, not *was made*. This verb denotes a transition from one state or mode of subsistence to another: e.g. "the Word became flesh," i. e. being God, the Word passed into a mode of subsistence in which He was man as well as God. Similarly we are said (2 Cor.) to " *become* the righteousness of God in Christ," i. e. to pass from our low estate of sinful humiliation to the high level of God's perfect righteousness. Thus, according to ver. 30, the Son of God, when He entered into human nature, *entered* also into the Divine scheme of wisdom, and translated it into life. For unquestionably the substance of that scheme of wisdom was the union of the two natures in the Person of God's Son, together with the manifold benefits flowing from that union. Of this hidden counsel of redemption, which was willed and planned before Creation itself, Jesus Christ was in His Person the *embodiment*, and in all that He wrought and suffered, the historical manifestation and *pleroma.* Thus He became *wisdom from God;* not " became from God :" the order of the Greek words is against that view. Again, as the Father in heaven was the first cause or fountain of this wisdom (ἐξ αὐτοῦ δέ, ver. 30), so Christ on earth may be regarded in His work as a cistern gradually filling with this wisdom, and after His ascension overflowing with it from heaven into the larger cistern of His Church below. This overflow commenced on the Day of Pentecost. Thus He became wisdom *to us* from God, i. e.

Digitized by Google

wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption:

31 That, according as it is written, [a] He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

[a] Jer. 9. 23.

wisdom from God for us to receive. But this abstract counsel or wisdom of the Father, which was planned by Him before the ages were made, and which in the sphere of time became concrete in the Incarnate Son, what was it? What it more precisely was, both in its embodiment in Christ and in its relation to us men, is further defined in three heads. The eternal purpose is drawn out of its secret depths (so to speak), like a telescope of three lenses, in three evolutions, each in its own place: (1) Righteousness (2) Sanctification (3) Redemption. (1) Righteousness of *God the Father* imputed; not the righteousness of Christ, for *that* is nowhere in N. T. said to be imputed. It is the proper fruit of Christ's *obedience* unto death, and the *imputation* of it to believers on earth approaches by degrees to *assimilation* precisely as progress is made in the inner life of sanctification. Indeed, the 'both and' (τε καὶ) indicates this mutual correlation. Of this absolute Righteousness God is the giver because of Christ's meritorious Passion, and *in* it the saints, after the Resurrection, are *set indefectible*. The last link in this threefold chain of wisdom is *redemption*, i. e. of the body together with the soul and spirit in the resurrection of the saints at the Parousia.

In brief, the whole means this: God—He alone is the first and efficient cause of your union and fellowship with Him who became flesh and translated into life and made actual in time the ideal plan of eternity, mediating for us the threefold benefit of that Divine counsel, righteousness imputed, holiness imparted, redemption consummated.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 2.

2. *with all who invoke* . . .] Does this perplexing clause (*a*) go with what precedes and signify "called to saintship *in company with* all who invoke . . ." that the readers might understand and marvel how great and wide was the circle of saints in which they stood? So Grotius and Bengel. Or (*b*) does *all*, pointing to persons saluted, mark the Epistle as a Catholic one? So Theodoret, Estius, and others. Or (*c*) does St. Paul, while he greets the Corinthians by name, also greet in spirit the Universal Church? So other commentators. Or (*d*) does the clause denote the *separatists* in contrast to the adherents of the Church in Corinth? So Vitringa and Michaelis. This view very unlikely. Or (*e*) is the meaning "all (generally) who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place (generally) their own (Lord) and ours"? i.e. their own Lord as much as ours. So Chrysostom, Theodoret, and many others, and our A.V.; and this seems the best view of all the above. The phrase "their own and ours" will then be an afterthought corrective and expansive of "our Lord" occurring just before. But what of the Latin Vulgate, "In omni loco ipsorum et nostro," i.e. with all who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in *every place belonging* to themselves and to us? i.e. belonging to them as a Christian society, dwelling where they dwell, and to us as Apostles wielding spiritual authority there.

If this be what St. Paul meant, then the clause "with all who invoke" will denote the Achæan Churches lying outside of Corinth and yet associated to the mother church in Corinth. Also the words "in every place" will not be used in a world-wide sense, as in (*e*), but in a sense of topographical restriction to the province of Achaïa. There was, it seems, a branch church at Cenchreæ, a harbour of Corinth. This last view is in harmony with 2 Cor. i. 1, "The Church of God which is in Corinth, with all the saints who are in the whole of Achaïa." This is in great measure Meyer's view also, who, however, refers the word *theirs* chiefly to the *Corinthian* church members, yet so as to include the Provincial or Achæan. See his ingenious note. It is the variety of ways in which words may be connected with each other that constitutes the difficulty of this passage, and this variety has been made possible by the growing omission of the article in Hellenistic Greek.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER II.

*He declareth that his preaching,* 1 *though it bring not excellency of speech, or of* 4 *human wisdom: yet consisteth in the* 4, 5 *power of God: and so far excelleth* 6 *the wisdom of this world, and* 9 *human sense, as that* 14 *the natural man cannot understand it.*

AND I, brethren, when I came to you, [b]came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God.

[b] ch. 1. 17.

2 For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

3 And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.

4 And my speech and my preaching [c]*was* not with [1]enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power:

[c] 2 Pet. 1. 16.

[1] Or, *persuasible.*

5 That your faith should not [1]stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.

[1] Gr. *be.*

6 Howbeit we speak wisdom

---

CHAP. II. 1–5. Application of the foregoing section (i. 17–31) to the *manner* in which Paul had come forward as a teacher in Corinth.

**I too,** as behoves *every* preacher of God's wisdom, "came to instruct you. How? **Came proclaiming not with high bearing of argument or of wisdom—the testimony of God.**" Solemn emphasis to be laid on the word 'God,' implying that the announcement of *God's* testimony has nought to do with flourish of argument or grandeur of philosophy, but much to do with plain simplicity of statement.

2. "**For I did not determine to know something** (τὶ εἰδέναι, not τι) **among you, only** (unless I determined to know, as I did) Jesus Christ. **and him too crucified.**"

The fuller sense is:—You may think that I had decided to be a know-something in your circle, but I tell you I did no such thing. One weapon of knowledge I resolved to wield in your presence, and only one, namely, Jesus Christ, and *Him* too in His deepest humiliation, as nailed to that cross which is the wisdom of God and the argument of His Apostles. I came, not weaving syllogisms nor twisting sophisms, but simply saying to you, The Christ is crucified! So Chrysostom. Most commentators explain:—"I did not resolve to know *anything* among you, but . . ." which is clearly not so good nor so relevant to the context.

N.B. For this sense of τὶ εἰδέναι compare οὗτος μὲν οἴεταί τι εἰδέναι οὐκ εἰδώς, Plato, and εἰδὼς τὶ κἀγὼ τήνδ' ἔχω προθυμίαν, Eur. Alcest. 1107. Compare also note on ch. iii. 7.

3. *And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.*] Render:—"And I in weakness **appeared before you,**" i.e. in public. For this rendering see chap. xvi. 10 and note. Meyer's "I fell into weakness in your presence," cannot be right. Order of the words excludes this. In weakness . . as laden with a message that would seem homely and jejune beside a finespun rhetoric. Come from Athens, where he had partly failed, to make at Corinth a fresh attempt to confront the grandeur of Greek philosophy with the simplicity of the Gospel, was enough to make St. Paul timid. Of this contrast the Apostle was deeply conscious, and the weakness here described was ethical, not physical. He was naturally anxious, lest in poising the plain argument of the cross against the colossal fabric of a seated philosophy, he might fail: was a David armed with such a pebble to prevail against a Goliath in such a panoply? But in his "fear and trembling" the Apostle was encouraged by the Lord in a vision by night, saying, "Be not afraid, but speak, for I am with thee" (Acts xviii. 9).

4. *my speech.*] i.e. my mode of argument, or perhaps simply "my argument," i.e. the fact of the cross. "My preaching" means *substance* of discourse. The sense is, My argument and my preaching was not (better than *were* not) dressed in winsome arguments of man's wisdom, but moved in the demonstration of Spirit and of Power: i.e. in conviction of the truth, wrought through my plain preaching of the cross in the hearts of my hearers, whose spirit was touched by the Holy Spirit. "Of the Spirit," A. V. not quite correct: omit *the.*

5. *your faith should not stand.*] Probably states aim of divine purpose: that your faith in Christ might be based, not on man's wisdom, but on God's power, which power alone brought conviction through the medium of my discourse.

6. The Gospel, however, which abjures human wisdom, has a wisdom of its own: a philosophy is to be found in Christianity also. The sense is:—'A wisdom however there is, and this wisdom *we* Apostles do utter before full-grown and matured Christians, and only before such.' Here the particle δέ is *corrective;* "*Yet* a wisdom there is . . ." This wisdom in ch. i. 18 has been described to be as much greater than all human philosophies put

Digitized by Google

among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought:

7 But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom*, which God ordained before the world unto our glory:

---

together, as God is greater than man. Now come to view two classes of doctrine, the higher and the lower; two classes of believers also, the adults in Christ and the babes in Christ; two modes of communication, private instruction and public preaching. No contrast here at all between Reason and Revelation, as some think, but strictly between two philosophies, the philosophy of God and the philosophy of the world. It is not true that Christianity, in setting forth the bare argument of the Cross unto the salvation of believers, has no interior philosophy of its own for the few receptive of it. But observe that not only a contrast between these two philosophies is here indicated, but another between the deeper truths, or higher wisdom of Christianity, and the rudimentary lessons thereof. This second contrast between two classes of doctrine, the higher and the lower, brings to view two corresponding classes of believers, the full-grown and the infants; and in addition to this, two corresponding modes of instruction. In fact, the Apostle had hitherto preached to his hearers at Corinth such broad facts of the scheme of Redemption as were level to their low apprehension: he had not dared to spread before them the treasures of the higher "wisdom" meet only for the "perfect;" to such pearls they in their crude state would have been swine.

6. *the princes of this world.*] i.e. the leading men of the Jews and of the Greeks, the Gentile potentates including Hellenic philosophers and Hebrew doctors. Such "come to nought:" these luminaries, with their vain lamps, pale and go out before the day-star of Truth when it dawns from on high. "Princes of this world" can hardly denote "the demons of the air" (Ephes. vi. 12) as some. In ver. 6 ἐν cannot mean "in the judgment of;" *must* mean "in the presence or circle of."

7. The particles (δέ and δέ and ἀλλά) in vers. 6, 7, are to be rendered thus: *Yet* a philosophy there is that we utter before spiritual adults; a philosophy *however* not of this world, *but* we utter *God's* philosophy couched in a mystery. You must not suppose, O Corinthians, because human systems of wisdom are sheer absurdities to God, that God's wisdom has no system of its own; that the Cross of Christ is a mere insulated fact, a warp without a woof or a single thread without either. No, there is a vast scheme of wisdom in the hidden counsel of Redemption, which we Apostles step by step unfold to the spiritually intelligent. "**Couched in a mystery;**" no objection to this rendering in the Greek. The image of the great Eleusinian mysteries probably suggested this word *mystery* to St. Paul at Corinth. It appears that this manifold design of God's wisdom was unfolded to the Apostles, in as far as it was unfolded to them, by a graduated revelation. From their inspired lips men received the heavenly doctrines by a process of initiation also graduated to their several scales of capacity. In this process disciples were the instructed, Apostles were the hierophants or communicative channels, the Holy Spirit the illuminative agent. Perhaps the rendering "we utter God's wisdom in the form of a mystery" may be preferred by some scholars. This rendering will not disturb the above explanation, but will rather serve to bring out the true idea of the passage, namely, that this wise scheme of God being in *substance* a mystery, must likewise in the *form* of a mystery be communicated to men, little by little. The curtain must be lifted with a caution, measured by the spiritual intelligence of the spectators ἐποπταί. Not unlike the Greek phrase, "we utter in a mystery," is our English, "we speak in a whisper." It should be constantly borne in mind that in these chapters "the wisdom of God" being in substance a "great mystery" (1 Tim. iv. 1) denotes not merely the broad facts of Redemption that are received by faith, but the philosophy that environs those facts, the heights and the depths that overhang and underlie the central doctrines brought to view. It should also not be forgotten that this "wisdom" is in its substance immensely superhuman, and yet intended for human apprehension; it therefore demands both a human organ and a divine agent for its communication from God to man. There is also required in him, who communicates it, discrimination of character and "discernment of spirits," so as to administer it by wise instalments.

The long *hidden away* (ἀποκεκρυμμένην) wisdom. Perfect tense denotes a *state* of concealment consequent upon some act of concealment which once took place in heaven.

*ordained before the world unto our glory.*] This clause contains much in little. This manifold wisdom in all its reaches of height and depth and length and breadth "the only wise

Digitized by Google

8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

[d] Is. 64. 4. 9 But as it is written, [d] Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

10 But God hath revealed *them*

---

God" did, before the institution of the ages, fore-ordain with a view to the glory of us. Of whom? The glory of the elect was the final aim (1) of creation, (2) of redemption. To the divine Mind the sequence of ideas was (1) the glory, (2) redemption for that glory, (3) creation for the redemption and the glory. In the evolution in time and the execution of this far-reaching plan, the order of the facts was in the nature of things reversed. For this Pauline mode of statement, which will be found a key to unlock some intricate texts, see 1 Tim. ii. 4, "Who willeth all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth;" where clearly in the divine thought the salvation of all men precedes their instruction in the truth, albeit in the development of the purpose in time the order of events is precisely reversed. Such seems to be the only adequate interpretation of this interesting clause, namely, that even at the time of creation God had already purposed in eternity to produce and set in glory a church and a kingdom called out of the world, and therefore He made the world.

**8.** This marvellous scheme of God's wisdom, which was to issue in the glory, none of the rulers of this world ever apprehended; for if they had apprehended this wisdom, they would never have slain *the Lord* of that glory.

In the Person of the Incarnate Son was embodied and made actual the divine wisdom: from Him it was communicable to others in the threefold form of righteousness and sanctification and redemption. Redemption, the last link in this chain, is a great consummation that is allied to *the glory* in which the wisdom is to culminate. This final glory, the sequel of righteousness imputed and of holiness imparted, and the nearer result of redemption completed, was purely won and meritoriously achieved for Himself and for His saints by the Son of God in human nature, so that He is now in His own Person not only the embodiment of the glory, but also the rightful *proprietor* thereof. The sense is clear, viz. "If the rulers of this world had ever come to know God's wisdom, they would have found the knowledge of this wisdom to be the sole way and means to man's high estate of glory, and therefore would not have slain the winner and owner and giver of that glory which is the goal and end of God's wisdom."

*crucified.*] The actors in the crucifixion are here regarded as the embodiment of that world-spirit which darkened the moral atmosphere of Greek philosophy. "The Lord of *the* glory" is the right version. (Comp. Eph. i. 17, "the Father of the glory.")

**9.** The adversative *but* is in antithesis to the negative idea of the first clause of ver. 7, the second clause of which "*for if*..." should be taken as parenthetical and subordinate. Probably in ver. 10 the δέ is *δέ in apodosis*. The meaning then will be:—"This wisdom not one of the rulers of this world ever apprehended, *but* what things eye never saw and ear never heard and **to the heart of man never occurred**, namely, **how great things God prepared for those who love Him —to us** (Apostles) **God revealed by his Spirit.**"

Two contrasts here implied, one between two classes of men, the other between two modes of learning. The great men never by *their own wisdom* got to know (ἔγνωσαν, aorist) the wisdom that leads to the glory, and to the Apostles it was *made* known by *revelation*. The philosophy of man wholly failed to conduct the rulers of this world to the philosophy of God: by another channel and to another order of minds was this true wisdom to come down from heaven. To the Apostles, and to them not through the channel of human lore but by special enlightenment, were vouchsafed glimpses and assurances of that invisible and inaudible and inconceivable blessedness which is in store for the lovers of God.

"Prepared," (not "hath prepared") namely at the time when He foreordained and foreplanned in all its details the scheme which was to roll out actual and become historical in the coming reaches of the ages (αἰῶνες).

**10.** 'To *us* Apostles God revealed them through the medium of the Spirit, who alone *knowing* the thoughts of God can alone *make* them *known* to man, for the Spirit it is that searcheth, and by searching findeth out all (thoughts) even the depths of God.' "Depths," metaphor from a sea or river, as when we look down into water and cannot see to the bottom, and what is beyond our ken is an unknown deep. The depths of the divine scheme of redemption are explored by the Holy Spirit and by His illumination of them revealed one by one to the Apostles. Or it may be put conversely:—"The eyes

Digitized by Google

unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

11 For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

12 Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

13 [e]Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy

[e] 2 Pet. i. 16.

of their hearts are enlightened" and their spiritual insight enlarged to discern those divine depths.

**11.** This diagnostic office of the Holy Spirit, who is the heart-discerner of all men (Acts i. 24), is further illustrated by an analogue from man's nature. For among *men* (emphatic) a man's thoughts are known only to the man's spirit that is in him; they are not known outside to the spirit of another man, unless he himself choose to make them known by oral communication. Even so the secret counsels or thoughts of God are known to the Spirit of God, and to none else. They *may* by the same Spirit, who alone knows them, be *made known* to others by revelation.

In ver. 11 the phrases "Spirit of God" and "spirit of man" brought together in this illustration indicate that the human spirit is something akin in essence to the divine. We read "God is Spirit," as it should be translated, and "God breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life, i.e. spirit." In truth the spirit of man is a ray of God's essence; it is the "candle of the Lord searching all the inward parts" (Prov. xx. 27); it is that whereby he is conscious of himself and cognisant of his own individuality; it is an *afflatus*, whether given by an act of creation at birth or by traduction from Adam; it is the divine *image*. This analogue, however, should not be pressed too far. The point of it is simply this: *none but the Spirit knows what thoughts are in God, just as in each of us none but his own spirit knows what thoughts are in himself.*

**12.** Connection is, Now *we* (emphatic) received what we did receive (at the time of conversion and afterwards) by revelation from that Spirit, who alone knowing can alone make known the deep thoughts of God in the philosophy of redemption. Not the spirit of the *world* did we Apostles receive, but the Spirit that comes out from *God.* As in ver. 11 there was a comparison between the divine Spirit and the human, so here we have a *contrast* between the world's spirit and the spirit which issues from God. The comparison implied an essential affinity between two things, the contrast denotes a moral or ethical antagonism. The world's error stands in antithesis to God's truth.

The term "world" here (Greek *cosmos*, Latin *mundus*) denotes properly the order and arrangement of things called out of chaotic material; the entire fabric of the universe viewed in the light of the *order* which prevails everywhere through the whole and in all the parts. In Scripture, however, the word is often used in a moral and a bad sense, something like our "wicked world." It is, in fact, a compact system of organized evil with its own principles and laws, a kingdom of darkness with its own hierarchy of unseen rulers, the devil and his angels. Moral disorder may be said to be the moral order of this *cosmos.* When our Lord came to visit us the "whole world lay in the evil one." Satan reigned, and his kingdom flourished. But a new kingdom was to be founded on the ruins of the old, and out of the same moral material. The *ecclesia* was to be *called out* of the world to form this new polity, the outlying nations still remaining, in St. Paul's pointed phrase, "without God *in* the world." Hence *ecclesia* and *cosmos* are so often contrasted, the former being to the latter like a small centre of encroaching light environed by a broad margin of resisting darkness. This vast *cosmos*, moreover, of which Satan is the prince and god, has a compass of unknown limits reaching into the unseen far beyond the earthly sphere of human souls, and it has a *spirit* also or guiding principle of its own, a law of error and of falsehood. This evil principle, while it seeks admission into all spirits, is mightier in the heart of *profane* humanity; it may be said to dominate outside the ring of the Church both here and above; see Eph. vi. 12. It also breaks forth out of its own circle of obsession into the city of God, and wins a footing in the Church precisely in proportion to the decay of faithfulness within the fold of Christ. This cosmic spirit of moral error and of false wisdom is shewn to be just what it is by the pure lamp of the Holy Ghost.

*out of God.*] God's own Spirit is here said to come and illumine man's spirit, a kindred nature, like sunshine filling twilight. "In order that we may know," the Apostle adds,



Digitized by Google

Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.

15 *f* But he that is spiritual *f* Prov. 28. 5.

to be true those joys unseen, unheard, unimagined, for this knowledge comes not from the outer darkness of error, but from the inner light of truth. The sureness of the things assured is as the sureness of Him who assures them.

13. "**Which things** (knowing them true) **we also utter.**" Utter them how? Not in the rhetoric of human wisdom, not in arguments copied from a formulated philosophy (that would be like putting new wine into old bottles, or dressing a man in a panther's hide) but in arguments taught of Spirit, with spiritual phrase **matching** spiritual truths.

N.B. For this sense of the very συγκρίνειν, see 2 Cor. x. 12, "We dare not *class* or *match* ourselves with some . . ." where as ἐγκρίνω means "I judge or deem A (to be) *in* such a circle, I class among," so συγκρίνω means "I judge or pronounce A (level) *with* B, I match or pair A with B." Another sense may be assigned to this much controverted clause, "To spiritual (minds) suiting spiritual (truths)." The same exegesis will apply here also, viz. "making spiritual truths to match with spiritual minds," so that the minds apprehending and the truths apprehended are to each corresponsive and co-ordinate. To either of these interpretations the Greek seems equally flexible: the (1) is more in keeping with the immediately preceding context; the (2) with ver. 6 of this chapter and with ver. 14. Chrysostom's view "explaining the Scriptures of the Old Testament by those of the New" surely is grammatically and logically quite untenable. A third way of expounding this clause suggests itself. "*For* spiritual minds matching spiritual things with each other;" for spirituals co-ordinating spirituals: i.e. for spiritual receptives putting together or compounding spiritual truths and spiritual phrase. To all these three interpretations the Greek is flexible alike, only in (3) the force of σύν is exerted not on the dative case. In all the three πνευματικοῖς is neuter. With the last explanation ver. 14 seems to run in harmony thus: "For spirituals pairing with each other or sorting together spirituals, but a *psychic* man does not receive what is pneumatic or spiritual."

14. We now come to St. Paul's trichotomy or threefold nature of man. A brief illustration of this important doctrine may not be out of place here. The triple constitution of man may be roughly compared to a cathedral. The body corresponds to the nave, the spirit to the chancel, the soul, which divides and unites the body and the spirit, to the transept, which divides and unites the nave and the chancel. The cathedral is one consecrated building with three main compartments, and man is one person in three natures, all consecrated in Baptism to the Triune God. Furthermore, the human spirit is the highest and the noblest of the three natures and akin to the divine, and therefore that which is immediately controlled by the Holy Spirit, who *through it* acts also upon the soul, and through the soul upon the body. In like manner the chancel is the highest and holiest compartment of the cathedral, in which also is the altar or table of the divine Presence. The above is merely an illustration, and, as such, should not be pressed. It may serve, however, to smooth the way for some apprehension of the difficult question of man's trichotomy. A *psychical* man, the mere soul-man—*animalis* (Vulgate) from *anima*, not *animosus* "full of spirit" from *animus*—is one in whom *psyché* or lower principle of life dominates. He moves not in the sphere of divine light and truth, but in the world of sense. If he is intellectual, he delights in a mental activity purely human and exerted on objects merely mundane, and is attracted by worldly philosophies that fail utterly to lead the mind up to the high truth of God. The mental side of the psychic man comes to view in this text; the *intellectual* rather than the *ethical*, not to the exclusion however of the latter, for between the moral and the mental there is a mutual relation and interaction. In this *homo animalis* the higher principle of life, the human spirit illumined and quickened intellectually and morally, does not dominate, has no activity, is dormant. He is one πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχων (James) i.e. "not having (in his own consciousness) spirit." Such a one does not receive, indeed cannot admit into—that which he has not—a prepared spirit any thing that is of the Spirit of God. He is psychic, not pneumatic: how can he entertain truths that are purely pneumatic? They are an absurdity to him. His habits of mind, modes and centres of thought, aims in life, lust of fame, pride of intellect, are all soul-like and sensuous, all *of* the cosmos and *to* the cosmos. Thus he is simply incompetent to apprehend what is extramundane and supernal; indeed he is not in a position to do so, for there must always be a correlation and mutual congruity between that which per-

Digitized by Google

Or, discerneth. Or, discerned. Is. 40. 13.

[1]judgeth all things, yet he himself is [1]judged of no man.

16 [g]For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he [1]may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.

Rom. 11. 34. [1]Gr. shall.

---

ceives and that which is perceived. Wherefore spiritual truths are "foolishness unto him" because they are spiritually estimated, i.e. are tested and sifted by a process spiritual in the court of the human spirit enlightened by the divine, and there subjected to an *anacrisis* or preliminary scrutiny ere they are admitted.

**15.** "Whereas (δὲ) he who is spiritual examines and estimates in all its parts whatever is presented to his scrutiny." "All things" here, as often, in a restrictive sense, "all things of the Spirit that come within the scope of his judgment." Meyer extends the phrase "all things" beyond "the things of the Spirit" to the prudential affairs of daily life, demanding tact and discreetness, and cites St. Paul as an eminent example of practical wisdom. It seems likely, however, that no more is meant than that he in whom the highest principle of life, *the human spirit instinct with the divine*, is dominant, ruling both the soul and the flesh, is one who by means of a critical faculty, enlightened and quickened from above, is capacitated to form a correct estimate of the communicated mysteries of redemption. These mysteries are that revealed wisdom of God which transcends the apprehension of the *natural* man. Cf. 1 John iv. 1. "Try, test the spirits whether they are of God."

"**While he himself is judged of by none;**" while he for his part is criticised by none, *i.e.* by none who is not spiritual also. The spirit-led man from a high level looks down upon him who is ruled by the soul, and is a riddle to him. The psychical man, whose spiritual eye and ear are stopped, can no more form an estimate of the pneumatical man, than the blind can of a painter or the deaf of a singer. So Chrysostom and Theophylact.

**16.** Proof that the spiritual man is not subject to any critical examination from any man who is not himself spiritual. "For who (among the spiritual) **ever came to know** the mind of the Lord, so as to instruct Him? Such a one, if he could be found, would be meet to instruct *us*, for *we* (the spiritual) *have* the mind of the Lord." The argument, put syllogistically, would run thus: No one can learn what is the mind of Christ so as to instruct Him; but *we*, the spiritual, are they who possess the mind of Christ; therefore we are they also whom none can so know as to instruct. We *pneumatics* are beyond the pale of critical inquisition or instruction from any psychical or natural man. "We have the mind of the Lord," does not mean, as some, "we have the mind or purpose of Christ as expressed in the counsel of redemption," but this, and something much more: the spiritual possess by means of membership with Him a mental faculty not different in kind from the mind of the Lord, for it is true that Christ Himself lives in them (Gal. ii. 20), and the heart of Christ beats in them (Phil. i. 8), and He speaks in them (2 Cor. xiii. 9). They also have the Spirit of Christ as well as the Mind. The last verse of this chapter has a pointed significance, "if," as Neander observes, "undoubtedly Paul said this with special allusion to such in the Corinthian Church as took the liberty of criticising him."

Two observations may be drawn from this chapter:—(1) When St. Paul pours contempt on all human systems of wisdom as compared with God's wisdom in the counsel of redemption, nothing is further from his thoughts than the depreciation of reason or of sound learning in the religious doctrines. There is in Christianity a divine philosophy that invites all reverential study. See this point discussed in Hooker (III. viii. 4–11). (2) A glance into the mysteries of "God's wisdom," which to the *cosmos* is an absurdity and to the *homo naturalis* a perplexity, serves not to elate, but to humble (ver. 10). As we are obliged to learn men through men, so can we learn God only through God, or through His Spirit given to us in the ministrations of the Church. The spirit of the world is at bottom that evil spirit Satan, the prince of darkness, who has his seat in the hearts of the sons of disobedience and rules the world from thence.



Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER III.

*2 Milk is fit for children. 3 Strife and division, arguments of a fleshly mind. 7 He that planteth, and he that watereth, is nothing. 9 The ministers are God's fellow-workmen. 11 Christ the only foundation. 16 Men the temples of God, which 17 must be kept holy. 19 The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.*

AND I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, *even* as unto babes in Christ.

2 I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able *to bear it*, neither yet now are ye able.

3 For ye are yet carnal: for whereas *there is* among you envying, and strife, and [1]divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk [2]as men?

4 For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I *am* of Apollos; are ye not carnal?

5 Who then is Paul, and who *is*

[1] Or, *factions.*
[2] Gr. *according to man?*

---

CHAP. III. The Apostle said (ch. ii. 6), "A wisdom there is which we utter among the fullgrown," whom he afterwards calls *spiritual men*. For the reception of this wisdom or higher philosophy of Christianity the Corinthians were not prepared at the time of the Apostle's last visit (probably two visits had preceded this Epistle); they were infants in grace, not further advanced than baptized converts. As long as they continued such, he could not speak to them as Christians ripe in the faith. They were '*babes* in Christ,' they were *fleshy*, σάρκινοι. This is not a term of reproach like σαρκικοί, or *fleshly* of ver. 3. It describes the first moral state after conversion, in a figure borrowed apparently from the plumpness and chubbiness of an infant, which to outward view is little more than a living lump of dimpled flesh with few signs of intelligence. During this, their period of Christian babyhood and Christian crudeness, the Apostle had fed them with the "milk" or simple diet of rudimentary doctrine suited to neophytes, not with the strong meat of the higher wisdom meet for the pneumatic or spiritual, not with the deep mysteries, for instance, of the resurrection, as brought to light in chapter xv. of this Epistle; but with the plain historical facts of the redemptive scheme.

"**I gave you milk to drink, not meat,**" to eat. Figure *zeugma*. "Gave," not "have given." When? At the time of their conversion and S. Paul's first ministrations. Calvin here comments, "Christ is milk for babes, meat for men." Rather milk here denotes the elementary food suited to babes fleshy, not the metaphysical diet fit for spiritual adults.

Not *meat* did I then give you, for as yet ye were not able to take *meat*. "**Nay, no more now** are ye able to take it." One other translation is possible, *not even now*. The first is the better: now also, as then, ye are not in a state for receiving the more robust diet of the higher mysteries, for ye are still, I do not now say *fleshy*, but *fleshly*. Here comes the term of rebuke. The truth is, their period of minority in the faith had lasted too long, and the necessary stage of moral fleshiness and crudeness had passed into the perilous condition of moral fleshliness. They ought to have grown in grace, they ought to have risen to the loftier level, in which the spirit filled with Spirit (πνεῦμα, anarthrous) guides the soul and rules the flesh. But in them the soul, the connecting link of the two other natures, the probable seat of the *ego*, had not striven upwards to the heaven-born sphere of the spirit, but had been allowed to sink down into the worldly domain of the flesh. A proof of this, soon to be cited, was their contentiousness and sectarian arrogance. The principle of life, which breathes love and peace, still remained in them a germ unevolved and dormant. They had become carnal-minded. Ample evidence of this was to be found in their rivalries and divisions, themselves "works of the flesh" (Gal. i. 20).

3. For *whereas* (ethical *ground* of the statement) there is jealousy and strife of words and splits into parties among you, are ye not *carnal*, walking as men, walking not in the Spirit, but in the weakness of unaided humanity? What precise shade of meaning, bright or dull, attaches to the word *men* here, is (as in so many other words, e. g. δαίμων) simply determined by the society of words surrounding it. It does not lie in the term itself. A glowworm shines in the night, is dark in the day, but the same glowworm still.

5. *What then?*] The connection is, Your carnal-mindedness has evinced itself in contentiousness and party divisions. One calls himself a Pauline, another an Apolloite. I ask therefore, What is Paul? What is Apollos? What are they, in the nature of their office, that you should make them leaders of parties or rival heads of theological schools? *What* are they? Nought but ministers; ladders by which wisdom is

Digitized by Google

Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?

6 I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.

7 So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.

8 Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one: [k]and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour.

[k] Ps. 62. 12. Gal. 6. 5.

scaled; subordinates, not principals. They are servants *by* whom, not masters *in* whom, ye believed (*Bengel*) when you first believed; men by whose ministries in the power of the Holy Ghost ye came to believe in the one divine Master. They were but agents under God, chosen agents for the production of faith. Ministers were they, "and that too *as*," i.e. precisely in the way and manner in which the Lord endowed them. Observe that *as* here denotes not degree or extent, but *manner*: it points to the specific nature of the work assigned to each of the two teachers. Paul was to plant the Tree of the Church at Corinth, Apollos was to water and foster what had by him been planted. They were, each in his own assigned department, human instruments divine: from God, the efficient cause working in them and through them both, came the blessing of increase and "fruit of labour."

**Planted—watered.**] Both aorists signifying not at all "transitory acts," as Wordsworth, but actions begun, continued, completed. The length of the time depends entirely upon circumstances and the nature of the action. Thus, ἐβασίλευσεν, if it mean "he came to the throne," denotes short time; if it mean "he reigned," then it may denote any number of years from one upwards.

6. *gave the increase.*] Excellent rendering. Imperf. tense, perhaps implying process or continuance; more likely, however, it is an imperfect containing two aorists. On each occasion of planting and of watering God gave the increase.

7. *So then . . .*] Render "**so that neither is he that planteth something nor he that watereth something, but he that giveth the increase God** (He is something)." The sense is as follows; the conclusion is, that neither Paul nor Apollos is a somebody, such as to be made leaders or heads of rival schools. (Accentuate τὶ with a grave; Lat. *aliquid*, "something or other," not *quidquam*.) Bengel also seems to take this view, as he shrewdly adds, "God is something; and because He is alone, all things." If, however, the ordinary rendering "anything" be preferred, we must explain, "but God, who giveth the increase, is everything." This ellipse of a contrary to be extracted from its own contrary is common enough in language. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. "Forbidding to marry, *bidding* to abstain from meats;" and Hor. Sat., "Qui fit Mæcenas ut nemo . . . . contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis," where from *nemo* is to be supplied *quisque* before laudet.

8. Transition to the *recompense of teachers* hereafter, according to the *quality* of their work here.

*Now the planter and the waterer are one thing.*] Viewed in the light of subordination to the High God, they are just one element. Like one bough of two branches or one fork of two prongs, Paul and Apollos are both together in the hand of the Almighty one ministerial implement, disparting into two distinct lines of office, that of planting or founding a church and that of nurturing and edifying the same. In relation to Him, who from heaven employs them here on earth, the two persons are but as one thing; even as from the summits of a stately cathedral two neighbouring houses far below seem dwarfed and blended into an indistinguishable one; but when you descend, they are found on nearer inspection to be two several habitations. And this relative oneness of element is true of all who are officially engaged in God's service, however manifold their several employments.

The word "one" here has no allusion whatever, as some think, to the *unity* of the Corinthian Church disturbed by dissensions. That idea quite breaks the harmony. It is true that in St. Paul's Epistle the very important word *one* often signifies not "one and no more than one," but "one and no less than one." This view of its meaning will be found a key to unlock some hard texts, e.g. "God is one who will justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision by the (same) faith;" where God is described as no less than one to Jew and Gentile in justifying both by the same method of faith; "faith" being therefore twice repeated. And so Gal. iii. 21, "God is one," clearly means that he is alien to all internal division or duality necessitating a mediator.

The sense of this verse is, Though the labourers in the vineyard are one as a *group* of labourers under God their employer, yet, their lines of labour being distinct, each shall receive

Digitized by Google

9 For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's [1]husbandry, *ye are* God's building.

[1] Or, *tillage.*

10 According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

11 For other foundation can no

---

from God a specific recompense, measured by the quality of his specific work. See our Lord's parable of the talents, from which we learn that in the future Aeon one faithful servant will be set over five communities or polities to govern them, another over ten, each in exact proportion to his own employment of the talents entrusted to him in this Aeon. The reward is of free grace unquestionably, and of free grace *because of* the one great work that was once wrought by the one Redeemer for all mankind; but nevertheless it will be apportioned to every faithful servant precisely *according to* his own labour in the Master's vineyard. There are degrees of service here and there are degrees of glory hereafter.

**9.** Reasons for the preceding statement that Apostles, and Teachers after them, are all in relation to God. One thing of employment here are they all alike, yet each of them to be severally recompensed hereafter, and recompensed in the righteousness of Omniscience.

"**For God's fellow-workers are we.**" The image now expands; it grows into a picture—a busy scene, in which the workmen and the field cultivated come to view; after this, the mode of cultivation itself is discussed. The "we" and the "ye" here are unemphatic; they have no stress. "For *God's* fellow-workers are we; *God's* field, *God's* building are ye." Here the term *God* is all emphatic in all its places. It is God whose joint labourers we are; it is God whose field in tillage and house in building ye are. How can one party among you say, I belong to Paul, another, I belong to Apollos, when both Paul and Apollos are but one thing of joint labour under God, to whom they belong? One in one twofold employment, yet being in two distinct lines of employment, to be rewarded distinctively and that in the perfect righteousness of Omniscience, after a scrutiny that appertains to God only, for God's fellow-workers are we. Surely the commonly adopted view, "We are fellow-workers with God" is utterly out of place here. It is a thought quite alien, breaking the logical continuity. How this view has come to be so current, it is not easy to see. Meyer says it is a linguistic necessity. This statement may be controverted. For if the Greek phrase in part may be rendered, as it unquestionably may, "we are workers together," i.e. with one another, why may it not in whole be rendered, "We are God's workers together, i. e. with one another"? Surely the σύν, or *with*, is linguistically flexible to either, while the logic of the sentence loudly demands the latter interpretation. The thrice repeated genitive also demands this. Moreover it is clear that the σύν looks back upon the ἕν; *i.e.* the idea of *fellowship* in the work reproduces and strengthens the idea of the *oneness* of service.

**10.** In expansion of the foregoing. "According to the grace of God that **was** given to me." Given when? At his conversion when he was called to be an Apostle rather than afterwards when he was called to found the church at Corinth. The clause evinces in the Apostle true humility and a sense of dependence on God quite in keeping with what precedes and with what follows, "As a wise masterbuilder I **laid foundation**:" not *a* nor *the*, but simply "laid foundation." See ver. 16, "temple of God." "Wise" in the wisdom of God and in proportion to what was bestowed of that wisdom. No approach to boasting here. The Apostle does not call himself a skilful masterbuilder, but likens himself to one. "I laid foundation and another buildeth thereupon," i.e. Apollos and other successors of the founder. "But let every successor look well *how* he builds thereupon: for *as* other foundation none can by any possibility lay besides the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ, *so* if any one builds upon the foundation, which I laid, what is good and solid or what is poor and brittle, his work shall be made manifest accordingly."

Such seems to be the logical connexion. The ground for the caution, "But let every man look well," is contained in the latter clauses.

N.B. As to the grammatical construction, the clause "Other foundation can . . ." is clearly a *quasi-protatic* clause; a construction common in Greek.

The above explanation expanded is, Let every after-builder see that *his part* of the superstructure correspond to the foundation. Let him therefore take heed *with what material* he builds upon the foundation that I laid, for other foundation can none lay than that which is already laid; and so if any man build upon this foundation, he is accountable for the correspondency of his contribution.

**11.** "Other than," or "besides," i.e., alongside of it, as a rival, and so not only other but also different. The participle does not

Digitized by Google

man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

12 Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble;

13 Every man's work shall be

---

mean, "lying there by His own free will and act," as some, but is purely passive; in fact, it is scarcely correct to say that the passive voice in Greek is used for the middle or the middle for the passive. The Greek means "already laid." Laid by whom? Not doctrinally laid by St. Paul, for then we should have expected τεθέντα. It must therefore mean laid *essentially* by God, the supreme Designer of the kingdom, and the "only wise" architect of the Church, His Incarnate Son being the true and eternal foundation stone thereof. Now this foundation stone being Jesus Christ Himself, and having been laid by the Father Himself, no other foundation stone whatsoever of the Church Catholic can by any being whomsoever be set alongside of it. Absolutely impossible: for God gave His only Son to be this foundation-stone. Jesus Christ in His Person is this *fundamentum essentiale*. See the full and formal statement in ver. 11, "which is *Jesus Christ*." This idea must have been in St. Paul's mind when he penned the subordinate clause "for other foundation *can* no one lay." The truth is, in this passage there are two distinct *layings* of foundation, *one by the Apostle, the other by God;* one subjective, the other objective. The foundation laid by St. Paul was Christ *preached* and *taught* in the work of His crucifixion and afterwards of His resurrection; the foundation already laid by God was Christ Jesus Himself crucified and risen. The same corner-stone in different fashion was laid by both, *essentially* by the Divine Architect in heaven, and then *doctrinally* by His inspired masterbuilder on earth.

**12.** 'If any one build upon this foundation (which I subjectively laid in my teaching at Corinth, because God had already laid the same objectively in heaven) gold, silver, stones of value, timber, hay, stubble, he must take heed what sort of material he build upon *such* a foundation, for he is accountable, and he may win or he may lose a great recompense. If what he contributes to the superstructure be in keeping with the substratum, of material sound and solid, such as shall be fireproof, he shall be rewarded; but otherwise, if his work be of inferior and combustible stuff, he shall be mulcted of his reward, yet himself shall be saved, yet so saved as through fire.'

The figure here before the Apostle's mind is not that of the Church Catholic, nor yet (so to speak) that of a Corinthian side-chapel of the same; although probably the term "building" of ver. 9 suggests the idea of "temple" in ver. 16. It is rather the image of a house in building, of a doctrinal edifice, for the building materials are doctrines, yet doctrines bearing on persons, and the foundation, which St. Paul himself laid, is (1) the cardinal dogma of Christ nailed to the cross for the sin of the world, (2) that of Christ risen from the dead for the life of all believers. Upon these fundamental dogmas other cognate teachings, such as a dying to sin and a living unto righteousness, were to be afterwards superadded, layer upon layer, storey upon storey, wisdom upon wisdom. Great care was to be taken what sort of doctrinal material was reared upon the Pauline foundation of Christ crucified. If the superstructure corresponded to the substratum, the house-in-building (οἰκοδομή) would become a palace, otherwise a cottage. If noble and durable material were mixed with worthless and perishable, the house would become here and there palace, here and there cottage, a strange mosaic and unseemly patchwork of interwoven incongruities, grand and mean, strong and weak, splendid and sordid. Only what was beautiful and solid and in harmony with the foundation would be able to abide the testing fire of the Parousia; all that was rubbish would perish.

It is also possible that the materials of this edifice may denote not only abstract doctrines but also *doctrines moulding* persons, and, if the idea be pushed, even *persons moulded* by doctrines. How easy the transition to and fro! Hence the teachers were to be very selective in what they laid on the fabric, because as the teachers, so the teaching, and as the teaching, so the taught. In that case the doctrinal house will, after the manner of a dissolving view, slowly melt away and then reappear as a spiritual church, or the process of transition may be precisely reversed, namely, from persons to doctrines, from a church to a house. Certainly the phrase "God's building" has a concrete look about it; and it is not improbable that just here there was present to the writer's mind the image of a spiritual edifice of *members* taught, which later on transfigured itself into a theological edifice of *doctrines* taught. The new materials built into the fabric clearly denote Christian doctrines received and assimilated by the hearers. Meyer says truly, "The various specimens of building material, set side by side in vivid asyndeton," *i.e.* a series of six substantives without any connecting *and*, "denote the various matters of doctrine

Digitized by Google

made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it [1]shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.

[1] Gr. *is revealed.*

14 If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

15 If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.

16 [i]Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and *that* the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

[i] ch. 6 19.

---

propounded by the teachers." He might have added "and assimilated by the taught."

"The stones of value" seem to mean here, not what we call precious stones, but *marble* or *granite*, contrasted with combustible timber and stubble. In sum, in this rising edifice of Christian doctrines received into the constitution and fabric, all that is according to the Truth abides; all that is not so, comes to nought. We must not, however, suppose that the wood and hay represent downright false or antichristian dogmas: rather they symbolise spurious, vapid, unprofitable discourses, for even expounders of this inferior class are described as losing their reward as teachers, but saving their souls as believers. It is probable that the "wood, hay, stubble," also indicate the theosophic teaching and cumbersome traditions which afterwards, as we now know, and as St. Paul probably foresaw (see 1 Tim. iv. 1 . . .), crept largely into the Catholic Church.

13. "Every man's work in the masonry of teaching shall come to light, for the day shall make it clear." The word *it* denotes what the spiritual mason has wrought into the fabric. "The day" is the day of the Parousia or Personal Advent. "Shall make the work clear because it is revealed in fire." What is revealed? The day itself? Bengel says, "the Lord himself," for when the Parousia draws nigh, He will come in fire of flame (2 Thess. i. 8). The sense remains undisturbed. The fire is not, as Chrysostom explains, the fire of Gehenna, for Christ will be manifested *in* it, environed by it. It is rather a fire of probation, an immaterial touchstone of celestial fire, tasting and testing the *quality* of every teacher's work, leaving alone what is sound and solid, but dissolving and consuming all that is rotten. The Roman Catholic views of purgatory receive no countenance from this text, for the fire in this instance is not a "refiner's fire" of purification, but simply a sifting and distinguishing fire of separation. The same divine law, that guides the selective wisdom in its march through mankind to choose the fittest vessels, is to guide the discriminative fire in the day of judicial sifting. Literally, "the character of every teacher's work the fire itself shall *assay*." Metaphor from assaying metals. "Itself" here means "by its own intrinsic virtue" that of assaying. "This text," says Bengel, "so far from fanning the flames of purgatory, acts as an extinguisher to them." It may be remarked here that manifestations of God to man have been made with the accompaniment of fire. At the delivery of the Law on Sinai there was heard "the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of the fire" (Heb. xii. 29). On the day of Pentecost were seen "tongues as of fire disparting" selectively from a continuity of flame, and "settling down." And a similar divine fire will environ the Parousia, both testing and consuming; but whether penal or cathartic also—qualis futurus sit ille divinus ignis—αὐτὸ δηλώσει. In 2 Thess. i. 8, it is a fire of *retribution*, seizing upon two classes of offenders.

15. *shall be burned.*] Render "shall be *burnt up*," which is better than *burnt down;* this latter word is more suited to *a house*, the former to *work*. "Shall suffer loss," A. V. not right; the voice is *passive*, not middle. Render "**shall be mulcted;**" i.e. by some one. By whom? By the judge. This mulct or fine is clearly negative, not positive: the worthless teacher shall not be fined in aught that he has, but shall fail to win what is in store for every sound teacher. Genuine, not spurious, material laid on the spiritual fabric shall be recompensed.

"**Yet** himself shall be saved, *yet* so saved as through fire." The δέ twice *corrective*. What is the image here? That of an inhabitant of the house escaping through the flames, as some? Not so: that idea is a disturbing and confusing element. Or is it the figure of a builder still busy in the work of building, when he is seized by the fire which seizes the house? His labour perishes, his recompense is unawarded, yet he is saved himself, saved with the Messianic salvation or "gift of grace" bestowed upon ordinary believers. The reward itself seems to be some special position in the "Kingdom of the heavens" (Matt.). Failing this reward, he may sink into the class of "the last" (Matt. xix. 28; xx. 16. Comp. Daniel xii. 3). So Meyer. Bengel's illustration of this "salvation through fire" is thrice happy, "as a shipwrecked *merchant* with loss of *cargo* and of *profit* is through the breakers brought safe to land."

16. In order to connect this with the pre-

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *destroy*.

17 If any man [1]defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which *temple* ye are.

18 Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.

---

ceding verses a recapitulation is necessary. The Apostle's mind in ver. 16 glances back to ver. 9. "God's house in building are ye," where the idea of persons moulded by doctrines dominates, though afterwards this view becomes a dissolving view, and the same edifice reappears as an edifice of doctrines moulding persons. Now, it should be borne in mind that in vers. 4–9 the chief aim is to shew the absurdity of party divisions, as evinced in such sectarian cries as "I am Pauline, I am Apolloite," by stating that the Apostles and teachers in relation to their supreme Master are but *one thing* of employment, i.e. clearly enough, so many joint workers dwarfed in the dim distance to one indistinguishable element of service. If then the planter and the waterer are one associated activity moving in the same circle of Christ, how can they be regarded as two distinct labourers in two distinct quadrants of that circle? And yet they become such, if they are made leaders of parties, Paul doing Pauline work for Paulines, Apollos Apolloite for Apolloites. Divisions therefore and rival headships are absurd. Invidious distinctions and emulous elevations must all sink to a common level in the presence of God, for *God's* joint workers are the teachers, *God's* tillage-field are the hearers, *God's* church the house-in-building. The above ideas or arguments against sectarianism, clothed in imagery borrowed from an edifice, seem to fill the Apostle's mind, when he proceeds to the indignant question of ver. 16. "Know ye not," with a touch of amazement, "know ye not" as to this aforesaid house of divine doctrines that should make shapely the living stones thereof, as to this growing masonry of human spirits thus moulded and fitted for insertion in the fabric, "know ye not" that such a building, in its true nature, is no less than *temple?* "Temple of God?" and that therefore the Spirit of the God, whose Temple ye are, dwelleth in you! in you, i.e. as a community. Order of Greek words demands stress on "temple." The genitive "of God" is also emphatically definitive, though the chief emphasis lies on "temple."

The full and stately clause, "the Spirit of God Himself (force of article) *dwelleth* among you," is in its form suggested to the Apostle's mind by the *Shechinah* of the Jewish Temple. This Shechinah, not a biblical term, but one used by the later Jews and therefore well-known to St. Paul, denoted the visible manifestation of the divine Presence *dwelling* amongst the Israelites. It was a dazzling light or full ray of the divine Glory, chastened in its brightness and veiled by a cloud: this luminous cloud was said to rest or *dwell* between the Cherubim upon the mercy-seat in the Tabernacle and afterwards in Solomon's Temple, but not in Zerubbabel's. Precisely corresponsive to that Shechinah dwelling in the material temple is the illuminative Spirit of God dwelling in the immaterial. Or more exactly, as God dwelt in the actual Temple of Jerusalem by a luminous and visible manifestation of His Presence, so in the ideal Temple of the Christian Church He dwells by the invisible Shechinah of His enlightening Spirit. The idea of *light* is common to the two Shechinahs, the one being physically luminous, the other morally and doctrinally illuminative. "Dwelleth in you," as in God's temple which you are. This idea of "community" includes also the idea that to individuals God thus reveals Himself, His Holy Spirit illumining kindred human spirits like sunshine filling daylight.

"Temple of God." There were Hebrew converts in Corinth, and such would easily catch St. Paul's allusion in this verse to the national temple. This national temple in the Apostle's mind clearly enlarges and transfigures itself into a temple spiritual. This living temple of the Church Catholic is one temple: it is one and yet elastic: it *grows* and expands, associating to itself and assimilating (so to speak) many lateral chapels. It is in fact an organic unity of several organs, each in itself a unity: it is, in brief, a unity of many contained unities. Each several church therefore of the Catholic Church is the Church Catholic in miniature, so that of the whole all the several parts are themselves wholes: each branch of the Tree is a tree planted in Christ. The καὶ here means "and therefore," or "and so."

17. *If any man defile . . .*] Render: **If any one the temple of God destroy, destroy him shall God.** Vivid juxtaposition of the two eyewords. What does "destroy" mean? "Impair" or "mar" not quite strong enough; "ruin" or "destroy" perhaps better. The tense of both the present and the future is imperfect, and therefore denotes "destruction" or a "pulling down" in the attempt. This clause looks very like a citation from O. T. Temporal death was the penalty for damaging the material temple (Exod. xxviii. 43), and so analogously spiritual death is the result of damaging the spiritual temple. The word

Digitized by Google

19 For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, [k]He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.

20 And again, [l]The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.

21 Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are your's;

22 Whether Paul, or Apollos, or

[k] Job. 5. 13.
[l] Ps. 94. 11.

---

φθορὰ in N. T. means corruption physical and moral, whether the disorganization of the body in the grave or the disintegration of soul and spirit in Hades. "If any one destroy"—*how?* By worthless teaching? Not so, for worthless teachers do not, *as such*, *perish* at the Parousia, but are saved by their faith, yet so saved as through fire. They are not *destroyed* of God. Therefore the sense must be, If any one destroy the temple by sectarian spirit breaking out into *schism*. The Apolloite, the Petrine, the Christine elements of discord might prove so many, not dissensions merely, but *disruptions*. Then the spiritual temple would be split in three rents. Schism is a deadly sin; for whoso disintegrates the Church on earth, him will God disintegrate in hell.

This is an important text, and a brief recapitulation from ver. 5 onwards may make the above view more probable. Having shown a divided leadership to be a moral impropriety, on the ground that Paul and Apollos in their subordination to the High God are not two labourers in two quadrants, but one element of *labour succeeding to labour* in the whole of one circle, the apostle in ver. 16 proceeds to enforce his rebuke of sectarian arrogance by ascending from the idea of a doctrinal house to the conception of a spiritual temple. As materials moulded in the faith and laid on the foundation, the Corinthians are God's house: as a living organised community, they are God's temple. There ought to be no ill-sorted patchwork in the building; no damaging or rending of the temple: yet these evils must ensue, if the church in its members continue not in one mind, but get split into schools and from schools into schism. "Destroy him will God, for the temple of God is holy." To St. Paul's mind the material temple has not yet dissolved into the spiritual: that transition is effected in the clause following. The word ἅγιος means (1) holy in relation to God, as set apart from the cosmos to Him; (2) corresponding to that relation in moral conduct. In the first sense the term applies to the Jewish Temple and to the Christian Church alike; in the second, to individual members of the Church, who in Baptism are called out of the world and dedicated to God and to a life of saintliness.

"Is holy, **of which sort** or class are ye," i.e. a category, in which are ye. Full sense; as the circle of Solomon's temple was a hallowed circle, so the wider concentric circle of the Church that belongs to a greater than Solomon is hallowed too; within that latter and larger circumference are ye; therefore ye are hallowed in the hallowed circle in which ye stand. And because ye are holy as God's ideal temple, whoso destroys you shall be destroyed of God.

The construction of ἅγιος οἵτινες is this: as ὅστις sometimes = τὶς ὅς so οἵτινες=τινὲς οἳ, i.e. "a class which."

**18.** Emphatic warning to would-be party-leaders. The general form "let no one practise self-deception," becomes special in "if any assumes to be a *wiseman in your circle*, within the period of this Aeon, *fool* let him become. . . ." The term "wiseman" places in the foreground the Apolloite party. The eloquent Alexandrian teacher, following in the wake of the plain-spoken and dogmatic Apostle Paul, essayed to set the pure pearl of Christian doctrine in what he conceived to be the fine gold of Philonian philosophy. "If any one, . . ." is a general proposition containing a specific allusion to Apollos. "Within the sphere of this Æon" is a phrase that *covers* "wiseman in the circle of the Church," taken as one twofold idea. The sense is, there is no such thing as a blending or interlacing of the divine wisdom with such human speculations as belong to the present age of the world, even when those speculations are conversant about the manifold scheme of Redemption. Let one, who thus speculates, become from wiseman a fool to such wisdom, in order that he may become wise from his own real folly unto God's real wisdom. For *the* wisdom of the *cosmos* (articled stateliness) is folly in the judgment of God. "*Fool* let him turn, that he may turn *wise*"—wise in receiving and proclaiming, ungarbled with dialectics, the simple cross of Christ.

**19.** Reason why such wisdom is folly with God, shewn from Scripture. The connexion seems to be, as *Alford*, "If God uses the craftiness of the wise as a net to catch them in, such wisdom is in His sight folly, since He turns it to their own confusion."

**21.** "So that" (elliptical) the conclusion is, let no one boast in men, i.e. in human authorities.

**22.** This is a great text. The argument

Digitized by Google

Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are your's;

23 And ye are Christ's; and Christ *is* God's.

---

is "*all* things belong to you, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas or world or life or death. . . . *all* belongs to you, while *you* in turn, to whom belong all things, belong to Christ, while *Christ* again, to whom you and all yours belong, belongs to God." Drawn out, the sense seems, Why glory in human authorities? Why demean yourselves? why lessen your high position by sectarian divisions? Partisanship has no place in the Christian system, where absolutely *all* collectively belongs to you, not merely a share to these and a share to those: the full circle is yours, not a Pauline quadrant to Paulines or an Apolloite to Apolloites. If A boasts of Paul, B of Apollos, C of Cephas, I tell you that Paul and Apollos and Cephas *all* belong to A and B and C together. Where is party spirit? Paul belongs not to a party nor Apollos or Cephas to a party, but all three belong to all the church. When one of you says "Paul is my man," another "Apollos is mine," a third "Cephas for me," I reply that none of you has any man of us, but all of you have us all. Consider; is not the Father the first *Lumen illuminans?* Is not the Christ, who is Light of Light, the first *Lumen illuminatum* and the second *Lumen illuminans?* He is the Light to all outside of God, of all creaturely intelligences, of angels and of men. What are we apostles? We are but lights of the Light of Light, and that for the Church. The pure white light which descends from Christ upon us proceeds from us to the Church; but in what state? Through the weakness of human nature it comes in broken colours and requires to be recombined in the Church ere it can become pure white light again. From Christ then three divergent rays come single upon us three: from us these same rays converge upon the Church: there they meet, blending and interweaving their irradiation. You, the Corinthian community, should be the focus of this concentrated light; but, instead of gathering together in one sphere the various apostolic illuminations, you make sections and follow single lights, each exclusive of the rest. The cry "Paul is mine," is a divisive cry, that tends to make Paul not a means but an end; whereas we apostles are but instruments under God co-operative for your good. You, instead of using us as such, for as such we belong to you, schismatically and to your own debasement, misapply us by making us ends and not means. How can you, who possess all of us, so misunderstand your own high position as to confine yourselves to a part when you can claim the whole? It is beneath your dignity to glory in this or that human authority, when these human authorities all belong to you in their collective labour, for they are under God fellow-workers in one service for you all, their several activities being one combined activity converging upon the whole church for the common spiritual weal.

"Or world, or life, or death." "What a *saltus*, what a sudden bound (writes Bengel) from Cephas to the whole world!" It is indeed a sudden and triumphant expansion.

*Cosmos* here denotes the scene of man's earthly existence. The fact of the terms "life" "death" being preceded by *cosmos* is a reason for thinking that they are used in a *physical* sense: they should not be enlarged beyond this idea. These specific ideas "world, life, death," are immediately generalized and indefinitely expanded into "things present." "Things future" are not indeed specified in their contents, but seem clearly to denote what takes place in the state between death and the consummation of God's manifold scheme. In the long and chequered career of every saint, birth into the world, a living in it and a dying in it, then the state after death, the resurrection of the just, the triumph of the Church, are here regarded as so many intermediate stages all conducting, reach after reach, to that supreme felicity of the final glory, which is the aim and end of God's wonderful wisdom both in the scheme of creation and in the counsel of redemption. See Ch. ii. 7, *unto the glory of us*. In sum; world, life, death (things present), Hades, resurrection, judgment (things future), are by S. Paul here described as things all *belonging to the Church* with a view to its final wellbeing, because they are, in their sequence of order, the preliminary conditions and instruments necessary to the final participation of the saints in the divine glory. 'All these, as well as Paul, Apollos, Cephas, are yours, O Corinthians, as many means to one end, even your own eternal welfare.'

Others explain thus, 'the world is yours, because the saints will inherit the world, and even judge it.' This deeper view is true enough in its doctrine, but does not seem to agree so well with the context, through which runs the idea of a manifold instrumentality subordinated to one great end and converging thereunto

**23.** *And ye are Christ's . . . .*] '*All* these, as ministerial means, are yours, while

Digitized by Google

*you* in turn are Christ's, and Christ again is God's.' The double particle (δέ) here, as so often elsewhere, serves to turn the coin round and from the obverse to present the reverse. Its force is never conjunctive, often corrective, here *alterative:* for it brings to view a different side of the same thing. Here, so to speak, we have a figure of three sides, or rather an ascending scale of three degrees. On the first we see all things subservient to the elect, on the second the elect belonging to Christ, on the third Christ Himself to God. The first side brings to view the *active* proprietorship of Christians, who possess all things as co-operative to their eternal welfare, a position which must exclude all boasting in human authorities, because Paul and Apollos and Cephas are but ministerial instruments for the good of the Church. The second presents the *passive* appropriation of believers, for they, the owners of all things, are themselves owned by Christ and are His peculiar possession. The universality of the Church's absolute dependence on Christ must silence the party cry of the Christines who claim the Messiah as their own portion to the exclusion of the rest, whereas Christ does not belong to them at all: on the contrary, they belong to Christ, and not only they but Paulines and Apolloites and Petrines, for they *all* are Christ's, while Christ again is God's. This last clause makes this certainty doubly certain, verifying, as it does, how totally all partisans misconceive the dignity of their true position: for this universality of the appertainment of the Church to the one Christ (an idea utterly exclusive of all sectarianism) has for its highest correlative the Unity of God. All things of the Church converge upwards to that apex of unity. Confessedly God is one and alien to divisions. If to belong to Christ as separate factions is an idea conceivable, yet thus to belong to Christ who belongs to the one God —*that* is absolutely inconceivable.

"Christ is God's," theologically gives no countenance whatsoever to Arianism: the equality in essence of Christ with God remains simply untouched. For, as Theodoret remarks, Christ is God's, not as God's creature, but as Son of God. Calvin, Estius, and others miss the mark when they apply to this clause the confession "Inferior to the Father as touching His Manhood;" for clearly the *whole* Christ is here meant who being Light of Light possesses indeed the same divine substance with the Father, but at the same time that substance eternally *derived.* The Paternal relation is prior in order to the Filial. The genitive *God's* is merely the genitive of *relation.*

---

## CHAPTER IV

*1 In what account the ministers ought to be had. 7 We have nothing which we have not received. 9 The apostles spectacles to the world, angels, and men, 13 the filth and offscouring of the world: 15 yet our fathers in Christ, 16 whom we ought to follow.*

LET a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.

---

CHAP. IV. 1–5. From his own lofty level the Apostle regards the divided estimates of human teachers. He attaches no value to men's opinions of himself, nay, none to his own: Christ alone can judge aright. The Corinthians must wait till the Parousia, if they wish to form an accurate estimate of their teachers, an estimate to be based on Christ's verdict.

**1.** Is "so" prospective or retrospective? If the latter, the sense is; Under this assurance that all are yours, as you are Christ's, as Christ again is God's, let a man take count of us, as of men who are *servants of Christ,* not leaders of factions and minions of parties, who cry 'Paul is my man' or 'Apollos for me.'

*Us* rather emphatic denotes Apostles and apostolic teachers. *Servants* here means "underrowers" (to give the full image), as pulling together in one galley where Christ sits at the helm, the vessel being the Church, and the passengers the members of the Church. Not only is disunion in the crew fatal to progress and a thing tending to shipwreck, but the fact of Christ's presidency and magisterium should exalt high above petty partisanship, especially when the supreme owner and proprietor of the sacred galley is God. In this verse the house-stewards of God and dispensers of His mysteries are said to be strictly such, as being servants or underlings of Christ: for between the Father of the Household or Church and the distributors of the spiritual goods stands the Son. In fact the image is again an ascending scale or stair of three steps. The Father delivers the divine decrees or eternal *ideas,* elsewhere called in Holy Writ the long-hidden wisdom of God, to the Incarnate Son; He in turn communicates them to His own Apostles, selected by Himself to dispense and apportion with wise judgment these secret counsels or mysteries of God to the members of the house-

Digitized by Google

2 Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.

3 But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's [1]judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self.

[1] Gr. day.

4 For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord.

5. [a]Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts:

[a] Matt. 7. 1. Rom. 2. 1.

---

hold. The *House of God*, an idea latent in the word house-stewards, denotes the Christian Theocracy (1 Tim. iii. 16), of which Christ is the nearer Head, God (the Head of Christ) the more remote. It appears certain from some of the deeper texts of Scripture that *all* that has taken place in the world through all the ages is but the historical evolution in time of the manifold and marvellous counsel of Triune Deity, willed in a remote eternity, long prior to creation. These archetypal ideas both of creation and of redemption were in part only and by degrees revealed to S. Paul, and of that part he himself has communicated to the Church a part only: for that he knew more than he wrote is clear enough from his occasional ejaculations of wonder, followed by no elucidations: to such an inspired mind, teeming with superhuman mysteries, no marvel that all human science pales and waxes dim before a single ray of the divine wisdom!

**2.** After the office comes the mode of discharging it. Two readings here—(1) "This being true, it only remains to say," (2) "But what remains to be said is, it is required in stewards that one be found faithful."

**3, 4.** Sense is, 'In this requirement however, to *me* it is a thing of the least importance that by *you* **I be brought to trial** (or **passed under review**) or indeed by any *human* day (of judicial scrutiny). I do not care the least about any critical opinion of yours upon my official work: nay, I do not value my own: even my own self I do not pass under review: for it is true that I am not conscious to myself of any Apostolic delinquency; nevertheless *not on that account* am I justified, i. e. declared righteous and pronounced a just steward; to do *that* belongs to another: he who now *passes me under review* with an eye to that final decision, is *the Lord*.' "Day" denotes day of scrutiny or preliminary investigation.

Here the first ἀλλὰ = *nay*, the second = *still* or *nevertheless*. "For I know nothing" is a concessive clause meaning "For although I am not conscious . . . nevertheless it is not therein . . ." "Not therein . . ." means in full, 'It is not in the court of an unaccusing conscience that I am declared righteous, but in the wider sphere of Christ's *anacrisis* or preliminary scrutiny, for He *now* takes note of my work, that He may judge a righteous judgment in the great Day.'

The phrase "I know nothing by myself" means in old English "I am not conscious of any (evil)," exactly as in Horace *Nil conscire sibi*. The reason of this elliptical mode of speech is purely ethical: the conscience in mankind oftener accuses than excuses or approves; hence κακόν with οὐδέν is not needed. It is not necessary to say no *evil*, but it is enough to say *nothing*.

**5.** *Therefore judge . . .*] **"do not pass a judgment** (not 'judge nothing': it is τι, not μηδέν) **before the right time."** What is the right time, is immediately specified as the Advent of the Lord. S. Paul here uses κρίνειν "to pass judgment," the sequel of ἀνακρίνειν "to criticise" or "pass under review" antecedently to an ulterior judgment. The argument of the whole is, The searching eye of the Lord is upon my official work in order that *at* the right time He may pass a right judgment. You on the contrary first review me critically and then pass judgment upon me *before* the right time. You ought to do neither the one nor the other until the Parousia, when you will have sound material for making a true *anacrisis*, or rather a true *crisis*: for then the Lord will not only pronounce judgment but "also (another of the several processes of that Day) will bring to light the secrets of the darkness (that enwraps and penetrates this cosmos) and will lay bare to view the counsels of the heart," those hidden springs of action that now elude human ken. "And then (but not till then) **shall the praise, that is his due, come to each one from God"** (solemn emphasis on the word God). No mention of censure here; for the worthless teacher is to be negatively mulcted, see iii. 15. The inference to be drawn is: the meet measure of commendation, which shall be righteously awarded to every sound teacher, is an idea that simply excludes from the present time all unseasonable and undignified exaltation, whether of Paul over Apollos or of Apollos over Paul. These are but ministers for the weal of the Church, and ministers whose spiritual labour is to be estimated only by the divine Judge.

N.B. As to the phrase ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ the presence of ἂν clearly shews that to the Apostle's

Digitized by Google

and then shall every man have praise of God.

6 And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and *to* Apollos for your sakes; that ye might learn in us not to think *of men* above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another.

7 For who [1]maketh thee to differ *from another?* and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive *it*, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received *it?*

[1] Gr. *distinguisheth thee?*

---

mind the time of the Advent is a thing quite uncertain and problematical; "until the Lord come, *whenever* that shall be." The absence of ἂν would denote some definite conception of the time itself.

6. Object—to wean the Corinthians from sectarian pride. Rebuke thereof. Sense is; 'These remarks (from iii. 5 onwards), applicable to others also, I have transferred in outline unto myself and Apollos,' making of us two a sketch or representative figure of the true relations that should subsist in the Church between Apostles or Apostolic teachers and the other members of the Community. This pattern or sketch (σχῆμα) of these mutual relations, which stand in modesty and true humility, I have draughted from the others on to myself and Apollos for your sakes, in order that you may *in our instance* take a lesson and by a corresponding behaviour on your part fill up the outline.

Further explained in what follows—"For your sakes, that you may learn the (lesson), Not above what is written." The words "to be wise" are spurious. *Ne ultra quod scriptum est.* This expression refers apparently to the moral tenor of the books of the Old Testament. No allusion to a special text. It seems to denote a sort of ethical canon of the Scriptures, and the Corinthian brethren are here exhorted not to transgress this canon, but to keep within its limits by following the specific pattern of modesty and humility adumbrated to them by Paul and Apollos. This view is strengthened by the moral drift of the citations already made from O.T. in this epistle, ch. i. 19, 31, iii. 19. "In order that (the final end of the first end, which was to take a lesson in humility) ye may not be puffed up **one in favour of the one against the other.**" Alford after Meyer explains this, "that ye may not one on behalf of another be puffed up against a third," i.e. that ye may not adhere together in parties to the disparagement of a neighbour who is attached to a different party. Surely this cannot be right: rather the meaning is, "that ye may not be puffed up one of you in favour of the one (Paul or Apollos) against the other (Apollos or Paul)." This is simple and more in accord with the preceding context, when Paul and Apollos are specified by name and again brought to view in the after phrase, "learn *in us*."

N.B. No objection to this interpretation in the Greek. Here εἷς, like ἕκαστος i. 12, points to some partisan or other: one man for the one (Paul) against the other (Apollos), or one for the one (Apollos) against the other (Paul). These alternatives of partisans fully account for the *plural verb:* this as against Meyer's linguistic objections. For εἷς articled see 1 Thess. v. 11, "edify one his one." The indicative after ἵνα (comp. ἵν' εἶχον = "in order that I might now have," never "in which case") seems to mean 'that ye may not continue to be inflated, as ye now are, with pride of party.'

7. *For who maketh thee to differ from another?*] Render "**For which** (of us) **is it that distinguisheth thee,**" O partisan of Paul or of Apollos, that thou, swayed by our example, shouldst make a distinction between us teachers? Which of us marks thee singular? Is it Paul or is it Apollos who bids thee stand out from the rest, as without our aid knowing what thou knowest and having what thou hast? Nay, what hast thou that thou didst not *receive?* Thy partisanship had no warrant from any discriminative preference on our part. It is without excuse.

N.B. The τίς here is immediately suggested by τοῦ ἑνὸς and τοῦ ἑτέρου of ver. 6, and is equivalent to πότερος; a use common enough: see this ch. v. 21. Matt. ix. 5. Luke v. 23. The above view is better than the ordinary one, "*who* maketh thee to differ from another; for if "who" is referred to *God*, which is the general explanation, we look to the context in vain for a starting point of this idea.

After this the Apostle now breaks out into fiery vehemence: he thunders in sarcasms, hurling flash after flash in sharp peals of wholesome invective. The aim and end of this moral thunder is to clear the ethical atmosphere from sectarian pride. "But if thou *didst* receive, as thou didst, why boastest thou as though thou didst not receive?" Receive *i.e.* knowledge of salvation and spiritual gifts by means of our ministrations: in the foreground stand the Apostles, in the high background Christ, beyond and above Him God.

Digitized by Google

8 Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us: and I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you.

9 For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a [1]spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.

10 We *are* fools for Christ's sake, but ye *are* wise in Christ; we *are* weak, but ye *are* strong; ye *are* honourable, but we *are* despised.

[1] Gr. *theatre.*

---

**8.** Again the Apostle fulminates in irony: peal upon peal of cathartic sarcasm. The allusions in this verse are solely to the final blessings of the Messianic kingdom. "**Aleady sated are ye! Already grown rich! Apart from us ye attained to kingship!**" We Apostles did think that the Messianic fulness of joy and endowment of the inheritance and enthronement of the saints, all belonged to another Æon: but your tumid assertions transcend our sober instructions! "And I would, of course, ye *had* attained to kingship, that *we* also *with* you might attain to kingship!"

N.B. Βασιλεῦσαι in all three places means not *to reign*, but *to become kings*. The particle (γε), which only intensifies the word preceding it when that word is intensifiable, here throws a strong light upon the whole contents of the wish expressed. It may possibly mean "ay, and I would that."

*Apart from us* Paul and Apollos: a glance of rebuke at the Petrine and Christine *parties*. This lofty climax of refined irony, with its "of course," is calculated to put to shame the egotism of cliques. The underlying thought is, 'As apart from us you Corinthians would never have been brought within possible reach of the Messianic royalty, so if you ever come to sit on thrones in the future kingdom, neither will *that* high privilege be accorded to you apart from us.' Possibly a passing wish for the advent of that blessed enthronement is here denoted: at any rate, a latent rebuke is implied to the following effect: 'In so bearing the cross as to be fit to wear the crown, we and you, O Corinthians, are on an equality, on the same low level of humble endurance! but in eagerness to wear the crown without bearing the cross, you are far ahead of us: We are nowhere in the race! your sectarian egotism seizes beforehand what should come alike to us and to you when it is due. If we and you hope in the Church triumphant to be united in saintly royalty, we must in the Church militant be united in saintly humility.'

**9.** Connection is: 'I would ye had got to be kings, of course, that we too *with* you might come to be kings, for our Apostolic position in this state of humiliation is far from enviable.' Of the passionately uttered wish of ver. 8 the serious irony passes into a mournful gravity, and its reverse side presents a startling picture, evidently drawn from the writer's own bitter experience, of the cruel hardships and inhuman insults to which the Apostles, as expounders of a new religion, were subjected. "For methinks God exhibited us *Apostles* (the *genus*) in the light of last and least (anarthrous predicate), i.e. to be the very hem of human society, as men to outward view stamped with the signature of death, seeing that we became in the course of our ministerial labours a spectacle to the whole world, both to angels and to men." *As appointed to death*: Tertullian explains *veluti bestiarios*, "as criminals doomed to fight with wild beasts" in the amphitheatre. This view is thought by some too contracted: it is vivid however, and may be the correct one, as it seems to suggest the word "spectacle" in the next verse. Ὅτι—*demonstrative* use, not causal: Cf. Luke vii. 47. It serves to substantiate the foregoing statement.

There is nothing *figurative* in this last clause, as *Baur* maintains. St. Paul is quite serious in affirming that the Apostles are actors on the world's stage, while in the drama of their fortunes men and angels are the spectators. The inhabitants of heaven and of earth *do* gaze upon the tragedy of Christian sufferings. "Of men," says Theodoret, "some scoff and exult, others pity, but are unable to succour." "Both angels and men" is the right rendering, because of the article before κόσμῳ.

**10.** How different are the estimates formed of us and of you! "*We—fools*" (in the eyes of the world), "*you—wise*" (in the opinion of yourselves and others): we—fools *because of* Christ, for we hold forth the derided argument of the cross: you—sagacious *in* Christ: how enlightened are you in the circle of Christian knowledge! you even antedate the Parousia, assert the kingship, claim the inheritance! *We—weak:* (see ii. 3) "In weakness and in trembling I appeared before you" from Athens, is an instance of this. Mistrusting human agency the apostles look upward to the power of God for enforcing and bringing home their own simple argument of the cross, at least in the founding of a church. "*You* in high repute, *we* without honour!"

Digitized by Google

11 Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place;

12 [b] And labour, working with our own hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it:

13 [c] Being defamed, we intreat: we are made as the filth of the world, *and are* the offscouring of all things unto this day.

14 I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn *you*.

15 For though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet *have ye* not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.

16 Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me.

17 For this cause have I sent

[b] Acts 20. 34. 1 Thes. 2. 9. 2 Thes. 3. 8.
[c] Mat. 5. 44.

---

**11.** "Up to the present hour" all along what has been the condition of the Apostles in general? Simply ignominious: "we both hunger and thirst and **go scant of raiment** (ill-clad) **and are beaten with fists** (Acts xxiii. 2), **and are unsettled in abode, and we toil hard,** working with our own hands." The world's own treatment have we got from a stolid and cruel world, that cannot discern any self-denial in our calm endurance of its insolence nor any nobility in our rendering good for its evil. This meekness of suffering and retaliation of charity has been our rule: for "abused we give good words, persecuted we endure, reviled we entreat," (or "speak to the heart kindly," παρά in composition used objectively). The above description of Christ-like demeanour is made emphatic by vivid contrasts and asyndetons. Whether St. Paul here calls to mind the words of our Lord, Matt. v. 44, Luc. vi. 27, which he would know by tradition, is uncertain: at any rate, the moral tone of them breathes through this passage.

**13.** "The world's offscourings." The Apostles are described as though the world of men had been cleansed all round from its defilements, and they themselves were the scum and filth of the world's cleansings. The word itself denotes the refuse that lies around a thing that has been scoured, *purgamenta;* no allusion to "piacular victims." Sometimes, however, our idea of guilt or moral filth attached to the word περίψημα, literally "parings round, peelings, filings, rubbish." "Become thou our peripsema" was at Athens a formula addressed to human scapegoats, before they were pitched into the sea, in times of famine or plague, Schol. Arist. Plutus, 456. The noun being singular, full sense is, "Of all things the collective rubbish" or "sum of sweepings."

**14.** The rapids of invective subside into the gentle current of fatherly counsel. Castigation becomes admonition. The authoritative *we* is replaced by the affectionate *I.* The drift is, take the foregoing censure not as a reprimand putting to shame, but as a remonstrance from your spiritual father, whom ye ought to copy, and for this end I have sent Timothy to you, *v.* 17. But—this by way of warning to such as are inflated with party conceit—I hope soon to come in person: must I come chastising or consoling? *That* rests with you. "Not by way of shaming you do I write thus." "I admonish:" the *kindly* tone of this admonition lies not in the verb itself, but in the surroundings.

**15.** *For though ye have . . .*] Render and explain: "**For** (justifying the phrase 'children beloved') **if you should have ten thousand tutors in Christ, still not many fathers**" will ye have. Not "if ye have" in the present, but "should ye have" in the future: this form of the protasis makes it best to supply a future (ἕξετε) in the apodosis.

The word *pedagogues* (who, in most cases slaves, were charged with constant attendance on boys till these came of age) here denotes in a figure the *later workers* in the church of Corinth. Of this church St. Paul has been termed the *founder*, his successors the *after-builders*, he the *planter*, they the *waterers* or gardeners: now he is the *father*, they the *tutors.* The Apostle here merely wishes to remind his readers of his own paternal *rights*, which can never be invalidated by subsequent labourers in the same field. We may observe "tutors in *Christ*," but "father in *Christ Jesus:* i.e. a host of tutors ye may have in the sphere of knowing about Christ, but into the life of knowing Christ as Saviour, none but *I* begot you by my preaching of the Gospel. "*I*" here emphatic: mine was a moral begetting unto salvation; this took place once for all; teachers after me are not spiritual fathers but tutors or *educators* in the faith which I sowed.

**16.** *Wherefore I beseech you.*] Render "**I appeal to you therefore.**" Seeing I am father in the faith to you, I appeal to your feelings. The original word sometimes means "I call to my side" with a view to exhort or encourage, sometimes "I call or speak

Digitized by Google

unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every church.

18 Now some are puffed up, as though I would not come to you.

19 [d] But I will come to you shortly, [e] if the Lord will, and will know, not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the power.

20 For the kingdom of God *is* not in word, but in power.

21 What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and *in* the spirit of meekness?

[d] Acts 19. 21.
[e] Jam. 4. 15.

---

to the heart of another," "I appeal to his higher self."

*Be ye followers of me.*] Rather "**Show yourselves,**" or "**prove ye imitators of me:**" "me" unemphatic, not 'of *me*' but '*of* me.' Full sense is: Translate into your own lives what you have *heard from* me or *seen of* me. Engraft into your hearts and ways—assimilate my teachings and my practice with the docility of simple-minded children, discarding all self-assertiveness which inflates into sectarianism. *Imitators:* "Teachers turn out their pupils copies and reproductions of themselves." Xen. Mem. 1. 6. 3.

**17.** *For this cause.*] With this end in view, that you may be induced to make me your model in humility, I sent unto you Timotheus. He had already set out, but was not to reach Corinth till after the arrival of this Epistle (1 Cor. xvi. 10). It seems that this letter was sent by ship across the Ægean, while Timothy went round by land to Corinth. Paul sending Timothy to the Corinthians is a father sending to his children one who is their brother, being his own son in the faith, specially dear and faithful. It seems almost certain, from a comparison of *vv.* 14–17, that Timothy was a convert made by S. Paul.

*in the Lord*] merely shews that the paternal and filial correlation is spiritual, not natural. "Shall *remind* you" (gentle word of rebuke) of my ways of life—those that are in the service of Christ: i.e. shall represent to you my official conduct as it is seen in my invariable method of teaching, which everywhere bears the same stamp.

**18, 19, 20.** *Now some are puffed as though I would not come to you . . . .*] Render:—"**As if, however, I were not coming to see you, some got puffed up**" on this assumption: "**come however I shall quickly to see you, if the Lord will, and shall take knowledge** (by spiritual discernment) **not of the argument** of them which are puffed up, but of the power."

**Got puffed up.** Not as A. V. "are puffed up," but "became inflated." The Aorist indicates, not the existing state of self-inflation, but its rise and origin: the assumption that the Apostle was not coming to face them again is clearly described here as the exciting cause of their self-inflation. St. Paul's words expanded will then mean, The assumption that I was not coming to visit you (πρὸς ὑμᾶς = "to face you") proved to you an occasion for swelling into sectarian exclusiveness, and for mooting invidious comparisons between Pauline and Apolloite methods, till you began to weave a woof of philosophy into the warp of Christianity and to interlace the two wisdoms, which are to each other intellectually irrelevant, the one soaring, the other creeping, and morally antagonistic, the one leading to humility, the other to pride. By this contentious spirit and dialectic conceit you allowed yourselves to get puffed up, because you thought that I, who first came before you in much fear and trembling, had not courage to return to Corinth and *confront* you, and that therefore you were masters of the situation and might please yourselves. But you were mistaken, "for come I will, and that soon, to confront you; and then I shall take knowledge (spiritual cognisance), not of the logic of such as are swollen with intellectual arrogance, that indeed shall pass unnoticed, but of their *power*, even of that moral power of working for God and for the advancement of His Kingdom, which wells forth from the human spirit, as it is vivified by the divine, and is therefore a human power divine. For the Kingdom of God standeth not in dry dialectic or barren argument (λόγῳ), but in living power. The Kingdom of God hardly in *ethical* sense here = the Christian Community in progress, but rather the Messianic Kingdom (see above *v.* 8), as it shall be revealed in its establishment of glory after the Parousia and the resurrection of the saints. Members of this future kingdom-in-possession are the "few chosen" out of the "many called," even such as "believe unto righteousness," the honest of heart and steadfast in faith and holy in life.

**21.** *What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod or in love?*] Render "**Which do ye choose, with a rod that I come or in love?**" Not as in A. V. "what will ye?" For clearly the sense is: (τί = πότερον) "which alternative do ye prefer?" S. Paul fears the first and wishes the second. The



Digitized by Google

structure of this sentence ought to banish the so-called *deliberative* use of the subjunctive mood. For *that* ἵνα omitted compare Macbeth, "Go *bid* thy mistress, when my drink is ready, she *strike* upon the bell." Literally "*in* a rod." No Hebraism; common Greek idiom. The right sense is "come *with* a rod *about* me;" possibly, "come in the circle and flourish of a rod wielded." The ἐν denotes distinguishing accompaniment or circumstance: Vergil "horridus *in* jaculis." For this *elliptical* use of the preposition see Heb. v. 7. σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου, where some have erred, rendering "to bring safe out of death," whereas the true idea is, "to keep safe out of (the reach of) death."

*Spirit of meekness* not equivalent to "gentle spirit:" the term spirit should not be taken in the vague sense of *mood* or *moral tone:* it seems in N.T. to denote the outcome in men either of the good Spirit of God or of the bad spirit of Satan: *e.g.* "spirit of delusion." Here "spirit of gentleness" is a living effect called by the name of its living first cause, the Holy Spirit. It is in fact one of many divine outflows, that fills with light and power a corresponding nature or faculty in the human spirit. Meyer has a good comment on this text, too long to quote here: he thus concludes his note, "Observe that the Apostolic rod of discipline too is wielded in the power of the Holy Spirit, so that the selfsame Spirit works as a spirit of gentleness and of corrective severity (Chrysostom)." The legitimate inference is: all that is truly good in men has its ultimate spring in God; all that is evil comes originally from the devil.

---

## CHAPTER V.

1 *The incestuous person* 6 *is cause rather of shame unto them, than of rejoicing.* 7 *The old leaven is to be purged out.* 10 *Heinous offenders are to be shunned and avoided.*

IT is reported commonly *that there is* fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife.

2 And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you.

---

CHAP. V. The chastisement of sectarian arrogance with spiritual ambitiousness is concluded. The notorious offender in the church now comes to view: St. Paul reproves the scandal, and gives apostolic judgment.

1. *It is reported commonly.*] Render:—**Absolutely there is reported** (to be) among you fornication, and such fornication **as** (is) **not even** among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife."

N.B. Here the word ὅλως does not mean "altogether," as some, nor "in general," as others; for it does not in any way qualify what follows, "there is reported;" rather it has to do with the mind of the speaker, and is elliptical, meaning in full, "*On all grounds* I am assured that," i. e. "absolutely," see vi. 7, ὅλως ἥττημα, "absolutely a defeat."

The ὥστε with the infinitive gives a *general* definition of the *such*, i. e. "of so gross a kind as for one to have," or with A. V. "that one should have." Some quite erroneously "that one *has*." This general definition is in perfect keeping with the apostle's wonted delicacy: the specific allusion to the unchaste person comes out in the known circumstances of the case. Perhaps more in accordance with the order of the words and with the absence of the article before "wife" would be the rendering, "**That for wife, any-one should have his father's**" (wife). Compare 1 Tim. iii. 6, εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου, "fall into judgment—the devil's." According to the rendering of A. V. τὴν should rather precede γυναῖκα; see Mark vi. 18.

2. With indignation. "*And* (in the face of this scandal) are *ye* (members of the same church of which *he* is a member) *still puffed up*, and **did ye not rather** (when ye heard of the scandal) **go into mourning** (aorist), that so he **who did this deed may be taken away** from among you?" The manifestation of a felt sorrow was not only your duty, but a measure calculated to draw general attention to the scandal, and so cause the expulsion of the criminal by the Church in assembly.

*have not rather mourned.*] A. V. is too vague: for the aorist denotes (1) a time regarded as definite, (2) the *expression* of felt sorrow. This verb is often used in our sense of *mourning*. Æsch. Coeph. 173, πενθῆσαι τριχί means "to assume mourning with clipt hair." Two centuries after this epistle Origen used πενθεῖν in the same sense in connection with the same class of offenders: in his day also this outward exhibition of inward compunction for licentious conduct within the Church was customary. "The Christians *mourn as*

Digitized by Google

f Col. 2. 5. 1 Or, determined.

3 f For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have 1 judged already, as though I were present, *concerning* him that hath so done this deed,

4 In the name of our Lord Jesus

---

*dead* (ὡς νεκροὺς πενθοῦσιν) those who have been overcome by licentiousness or any other flagrant lust; and after a while, when these have given proof of reform, they restore them to the standing of catechumens, receiving them once more even as *risen from the dead*." The conspicuous lack of the like discipline in our own Church of the present day is a thing to be lamented: see Commination Service.

N.B. The conjunction *that* (ἵνα) here does not signify "in order that he might be removed;" for it does not imply *aim* or *design* on the part of the mourners, but a probable effect of the manifested grief, a result contemplated by the Apostle as likely to ensue from the exhibition of heartfelt sorrow. This use of ἵνα differs from the *final* or *telic* and from the *definitive* use: it may be termed the *subjectively ecbatic*, or that of contemplated effect. Many instances of this in N. T.: one in Rom. xi. 11, "Did they stumble that they should fall?"

The sense of the whole verse is, "When you heard of the scandal, instead of continuing to be inflated with your spiritual arrogance or intellectual exclusiveness, you should have humbled yourselves by mourning for the grievous damage and defeat sustained by the Church: this was your *duty*, and it was likewise a measure well calculated to bring about the removal of the scandal by the public exclusion of the criminal."

*For I verily . . .*] This verse justifies the demonstration of general grief with its contemplated effect of expelling the moral plague. Render and explain: This ye should have done, "**for I** (μέν=while *you* were blinded by conceit to a true sense of your position) **being absent in the body yet present in the spirit, have already decided, as being present, concerning him who has thus perpetrated the deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (you being assembled and my spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ) to deliver such a one**"—**My** before 'spirit' is emphatic.

In the above rendering the words *I have decided as being present to deliver* shew that this extradition of the sinner to Satan was an act, not of the assembly without the Apostle, but of the Apostle with the assembly, and of him present in his spirit. "*As if I were* present in the body," is the common explanation, but it fails to meet the diction. It appears from this and from other texts that St. Paul's own spirit, illumined, as it unquestionably was, and vivified by the divine, must have been endowed on certain occasions with a more than ordinary insight into the state of a Church at a distance. How otherwise is Col. ii. 5 to be explained, "In the spirit I am with you, rejoicing and contemplating (or looking at) your order." He writes as if he then discerned their rank and file. This spiritual intuitiveness and affinity and power of presence would be intensified in assemblies of the Church met together in His name, who has guaranteed His own Presence in assemblies thus sanctified. We may infer then that St. Paul could on occasions exercise this spiritual gift of supernatural immediate intuition, even as our Lord on earth in His own greater measure did, when He saw Nathaniel afar off under the fig-tree, and read his character, John i. 51. The prophets also of the Old Testament had this gift, e. g. Elisha said to Gehazi, "Went not my spirit with thee?" Why not St. Paul?

In the structure of these verses, 4 and 5, the apostolic sentence of the awful extradition as if unwilling to fall, trembles in suspense and not till after several lingering clauses does it descend, and then with solemn emphasis (see Bengel). The exact connection of these clauses is not easy to see: of the four ways, probably the best is to take "in the name of our Lord" with "to deliver," and then to annex the words "with the power of our Lord" to the words "gathered together . . . my spirit." "With the power" does not denote the spirit of the Apostle clothed with the authority of Christ, as some: that would require ἐν rather than σύν: while ἐν δυνάμει is a common phrase in N. T. this is the only place in which σὺν τῇ δυνάμει occurs: and this σὺν prefixed to the *articled* δυνάμει makes it probable that the word *power* (not = authority, nor=potestas, but *potentia*) is here a *third* element in the assembly superadded to the *you* and *my spirit*: so that the precise meaning will be, "there having been gathered together *you* and *my spirit* with the (associated) *power* of our Lord Jesus"; associated, that is, to give effect to the sentence executed in the unseen world and to restrict the hand of Satan to *bodily* punishment. It should be observed that this is a *decision*, as appears on the very face of its wording, not levelled straight at the offender himself, but one suspended *in terrorem* over all offenders of his class. This is all but certain from the form (1) "I have decided" (2) "to deliver (not *this* man but) *such* an one," i. e. any offender of this stamp.



Digitized by Google

Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,

5 [g] To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

[g] 1 Tim. 1. 20.

6 Your glorying *is* not good.

---

Nor are the preceding words "him who has perpetrated this deed" adverse to this view, inasmuch as no doubt in the march of the several clauses, which hold in suspense the judicial sentence, the Apostle's mind relented from *him* into *such an one*, and what began with the special ended with the general. What St. Paul for the present desires is the simple excommunication of the notorious offender: this, we know, was actually performed by a majority of the Church assembled (2 Cor. ii. 6), and that with happy results; for the man repented and was reinstated.

The *simple excommunication* of ver. 2 could be performed by the assembled Church, and its members are exhorted in ver. 13 to exercise this right. It seems to have been an exclusion "not from the mystical Church, nor clean from the visible, but only from fellowship in the visible in holy duties," Hooker, B. iii. ch. i. 13. The *extradition to Satan*, which accompanied the graver and compound excommunication, was an act reserved for the plenary authority of an apostle, as appears from this text and from 1 Tim. i. 20. Waterland (on 'Fundamentals,' c. iv. vol. iii. p. 460) defines this more extreme penalty as a reduction of the sinner "to the state of a heathen, accompanied with the authoritative infliction of bodily disease and death." And death, no doubt, was inflicted in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, whereas disease only was intended in this instance of the unchaste culprit. This is clear from the right view of this verse 5: but it is equally clear that the Corinthian criminal would by the act of extradition have been reduced, not merely to the state of a heathen, as Waterland says, but to a state (for the time being) worse than that. For his lot would have been not only exclusion from the hallowed circle of the *ecclesia* into the outer *cosmos* or permitted domain of the devil, but such exclusion accompanied with a special extradition from the government of the Church into the sphere of Satan's power and malice, for destruction of the sinful carnal nature by means of *grievous bodily affliction.* This is what Augustine calls the "severe mercy of divine discipline."

We should bear in mind that in this greater excommunication of a wilful sinner, Satan, the ruler indeed of this cosmos, yet now after the resurrection a ruler subordinated to the control of the ascended Son of man, was employed as a scourge of God under the authority of Christ: whose great Name is therefore invoked by His Apostle in the full presence of the Church assembled, and His new "power in heaven and in earth" is associated to the assembly and to the Apostle's *spirit* which is *there present;* associated thereunto in order to keep Satan's marring hand within due limits, lest from the body it should be put forth upon the spirit also. Under these restrictions the enemy of mankind was simply used (1) as a willing tool or instrument in smiting the body of the offender, (2) as an unwilling agent in helping to slay through the sorely smitten body the revived sinful lusts of the old Adam.

5. *for the destruction of the flesh.*] i. e. for bringing about the mortification of the carnal affections and lusts. *Flesh* is a word often used to denote that *principle of sin* in human nature which ever strives against the fulfilment of the divine law. In this instance of the Corinthian culprit the lawless tendency runs out on the lines of licentiousness. This licentiousness finds expression and takes effect in the material flesh, and so the ethical is designated by the physical; the unseen motions of sin are called by the name of that which is the visible vehicle of their manifestations. Similarly, but with a far different application of the term, in the famous text "The Word became flesh," the unseen human soul and spirit are truly in the background of the (sinless) flesh of the Incarnate Son. The preposition *for* (εἰς) here rather points to contemplated result, not to the exclusion of design, if peradventure the man's carnal nature may be drained of its energy of sinful life by the pains of the bodily distemper, thereby making true repentance possible for the sufferer, and possible precisely in the degree in which the old man dies in him.

*that the spirit may be saved.*] The *soul* of the offender is not specified here, because, being the seat of the will, it is designed in God's corrective mercy (by means of repentance made feasible through physical affliction) to receive a new determination of its will towards the spiritual nature. The man's spirit Satan is therefore not permitted to touch, because, being akin to the divine essence ("that which is born of the Spirit is spirit") it is the receptacle and shrine of the principle of faith, and is that nature which is *immediately* actuated by the Holy Ghost. Of course, the salvation of the spirit here specified involves that of the soul and body too (this the Corinthian hearers of the 15th

Digitized by Google

[h Gal. 5. 9.] Know ye not that [h]a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?

7 Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover [1]is sacrificed for us:

[1 Or, is slain.]

---

chapter would readily understand), inasmuch as the self-determination of the soul from the flesh unto the spirit draws along with the soul the body also, and thus the body, in itself *adiaphoron* or indifferent, becomes salvable because it has ceased to be a σῶμα τῆς σαρκός or body controlled by the principle of sin. In sum, it appears that Satan's permitted affliction of the physical body is designed to effect the destruction of the ethical flesh, and this result is designed again to make feasible true repentance, in order that the whole man in his triple nature may in the end escape "the everlasting destruction" and be finally saved with the Messianic salvation. The Messianic salvation denotes that complete salvation which is to be accorded to the *ecclesia*, redeemed out of the *cosmos*, at the Parousia and resurrection of the just.

6. *your glorying is not good.*] Καύχημα. Surely not *materies gloriandi*, as Meyer (who quotes Rom. iv. 2, where the word may mean "ground of boasting," but the idea of *ground* lies solely in the context: there it is the circumstantial combined with the essential sense of the word), but rather *gloriatio*, as Bengel, who however might have added *facta*. Here καύχημα is something more concrete than καύχησις: for what θέλησις (Hebr. ii. 4) "willing in process" is to θέλημα "determinate or declared will," what κήρυξις "preaching in process" is to κήρυγμα "preachment" (never in propriety "the thing preached," even διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος may signify "by the preachment of the world's folly"), what κρίσις "judicial process" is to κρίμα "judicial sentence pronounced," what βαπτισμός "the rite in process" is to βάπτισμα "the rite completed," not "that which is baptized"—that is καύχησις to καύχημα: this last word means "boasting uttered:" here it signifies "overt boasting," "palpable glorying." This true idea of the word is just what is here required by the antecedent context.

Explanation in full: "**Not comely,**" "not seemly"—no *litotes*, as some—"not well-timed is your attitude of boasting!" Is *this* a time to parade your lofty privileges of saintly kingship or to flaunt and flourish your Christian wisdom embroidered with worldly philosophy, when this scandal of the church stares you in the face? Theological pomp exhibited in the midst of a moral plague begun? *Mourning*, not boasting, should have been your attitude; deep contrition and self-humiliation, in order to check the spread of this moral miasma, for this flagrant relapse into heathen vices is a thing infectious. "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth by degrees **all the mass of dough?**" The position of the article demands this rendering: see Matt. xiii., "until it was leavened entire" or "all through." **Purge out at once** (aorist imper.) from the Christian community the old leaven of Pagan fornication and all uncleanness. Eliminate from the church this vicious ferment: stamp out the several sparks ere they gather into a solid flame. This residuum of heathen habits must be expelled, and that forthwith. The Jews, on the day before the Passover, were very strict in removing all leaven from their *houses:* see Exod. xii. 15 and notes there.

N.B. Ζύμη, fr. ζέω, *fervimentum* or *fermentum* = leaven, Fr. levain, Lat. levare; a lump of *sour* dough mixed with a bigger lump of fresh dough: its properties, to disturb, to puff up, to penetrate, to assimilate, to give character. The Anglo-Saxon *dough* = "wetted" or "moistened" = *farina aqua imbuta.*

7. *Purge out therefore the old leaven.*] The meaning of this clause is (*not* as Chrysostum, Estius, and others, "Exclude from your community *the unchaste one*"—that specific order is given in ver. 13, but) "Purge out the carnal habits of your old unconverted state, which after long repression are beginning to break out afresh, as indeed has been made conspicuous to the outer cosmos from the publicity of this case of immorality, a signal symptom of the corruption festering under the surface. Clear out this old leaven, before it vitiate the rest of the lump; that so ye may be a fresh-kneaded mass, a new mixture (φύραμα) of pure meal and sweet water, without any alloy of sour dough. Figure apart, 'that ye may be and continue to be a morally new community, disinfected of vice and disleavened of overt sin.'

*as ye are unleavened.*] *i.e.* in strict keeping with your normal and proper state of unleaven: live in harmony with your ethical *status*, which is a position of complete alienation and separation from all manner of profligacy.

This leaven of vice must be at once purged out of the "lump" of the church—why? Because the Feast of the true Passover has already commenced! The real Paschal Lamb was slain in *Christ!* What? Leaven in dough was there ever, when the *lamb of*

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *holy day.*

8 Therefore let us keep [1]the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened *bread* of sincerity and truth.

9 I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators:

10 Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world.

11 But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat.

---

*the law* was slain? Impossible! Immorality in the Church of Christ now that the *Lamb of God* has been sacrificed? Impossible! That this Lamb of God was slain, when He was slain, is an actual *fact* (καὶ; unless it signify here "also" = "besides" or "moreover"): *wherefore* in the wake of this great fact let us keep festival accordingly: if the divine antitype of the legal lamb has been slain, let not the moral antitype of the legal leaven be readmitted into the House of God; but rather let us keep the feast, not indeed that material feast of seven days on cakes unleavened, but the spiritual feast perpetual of a good conscience unsullied of any vice and ever cheered by a lively hope of the coming Messianic joys that are "unseen, unheard, unimagined" (ch. ii. 9).

*Not with old leaven.*] "Judaismi et Ethnicismi," Bengel. Rather *Ethnicismi* alone. Μηδέ, not μήτε, serves to turn round the coin of two sides, and after the obverse of "old leaven" or heathen vice in general, to present to view on the reverse the special vices of malice and of wickedness. These are genitives of apposition or identity, that specific moral leaven which is "malice" and that which is "wickedness." *Malice* = evil disposition or bad nature: *wickedness* = the same translated into life, "active wickedness." This idea of industry in villany lies in the etymon of πονηρός, one who is full of *trouble* to others.

"But with the **unleaven** or leavenless elements of **unsullied** moral **purity** and of truth." On εἰλικρίνεια see Plato Phileb. p. 53 a; where the whitest of whites is defined to be that which is most pure from admixture and most *unsullied.*

This allegory of the leaven occurring so soon after the Apostolic menace of the greater excommunication may have been suggested to S. Paul from Exod. xii. 19, "Whosoever eateth that which is leavened, that soul shall be *cut off* from the congregation of Israel." If this be true, it cannot be said that the insertion of this allegory in itself makes it probable that St. Paul wrote this letter just before the Jewish Passover.

**9.** Citation and elucidation of a *passage* in some earlier letter, which St. Paul's enemies in Corinth had misinterpreted. "**I wrote in the Epistle**"; clearly an allusion to some former letter. "I did write (ἔγραψα):" epistolary aorist out of place here.

**10.** *Yet not altogether.*] Render, "**Not absolutely** with the *fornicators of this world;*" "I do not mean absolutely with:" compare elliptical use of ὅλως in verse 1. Sense is, I wrote to you in the letter not to company with fornicators in general, not (I mean) unexceptionally, so as to include in the prohibition the fornicators of this world, or the covetous and extortioners of this world, or the idolaters of this world, since ye must needs in that case go out of the world. In the thrice-uttered phrase "of this world" *world* is issued in ethical sense and denotes the outside heathen: in the phrase "out of the world" *world* is used in the physical sense: migrate to another planet.

*for then must ye needs.*] Read ὠφείλετε and render "**Since ye had need in that case:**" *ye had need* = "ye would now have need:" compare ἐχρῆν, "it *were* right."

*Covetous,*] Πλεονέκτης, one who is eager to *have more* than his fair share or *more* than by right belongs to him: a greedy grasper: *covetous* is a good word for it, if by covetousness is understood a selfish hankering after *gain* of any kind. For this greedy lust of lawless *having* runs out on more lines than one: it is a moral monster of several tentacles: like the cuttle-fish, it puts forth many feelers armed with suckers. *Avarice* is a branch only of the root *covetousness.* Sometimes this pleonexy, or "amor sceleratus *habendi,*" is associated with adultery: but in that case it less denotes the lust of impurity than connotes a lawless desire to overreach one's neighbour; for the adulterer defrauds the husband in seizing what is the husband's property. In short, love of pleasure and love of money and love of power are but so many forms of this unbridled and unhallowed possessiveness.

**11.** *But now I have written to you.*] *Now* not temporal, but in logical and subjective sense. Render:—"**But now you see I wrote to**

Digitized by Google

12 For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within?

13 But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

---

**you not to company with any brother so named who may be a fornicator,"** &c.: *i. e.* not to consort with any one bearing the name of Christian who may be given to such vices. I wrote to you—clearly, in my former epistle which you misunderstood.

The term *idolater* as applied to a "brother" must here denote one who partook of sacrifices offered to idols, not one who offered sacrifice. "No, not to eat with," *i. e.* to sit at the same table. No allusion to *agapæ*, or to the Lord's Supper. The prohibition is from all social intercourse with *brethren* who practise heathen vices, inasmuch as convivial fellowship with such men fosters evil communications, and "evil communications corrupt good manners."

**12.** *For what have I to do.*] Render:—"For *what* **does it concern me** ("me" enclitic, not emphatic) to judge them also who are outside the pale?" "The outside"—a designation applied by the Jews to the heathen, by Christians to unbelievers. "To judge," *i.e.* negatively, by exclusion from social intercourse.

"Is it not those who are *within* the pale, not outside, that *you* judge?" Why should you have thought that it concerns me to judge by exclusion those profligates who are not Christians, when *you* judge in like manner *only* those who are professing Christians? Argument of the whole is, I wrote to you in my former letter not to associate with immoral persons, of course I meant with immoral *members of the Church:* this natural limitation you should have perceived, because you yourselves apply the same principle of exclusive judgment or discretionary discipline, not to the outside heathen, but to those only who are within the pale. Both you and I thus judge men of the *ecclesia;* men of the *cosmos* are left by both of us alike to *God's* judgment; all who are beyond the hallowed circle *He* and He alone judgeth. (κρίνει or κρινεῖ; sense not altered).

**13.** Summary order for the excommunication, not the extradition, of the immoral man. "Remove at once (aor. imper.) the evildoer out of your own midst," in which you have too long tolerated and harboured him. Τὸν πονηρόν, strong word, often applied to Satan himself, *e.g.* in the Lord's Prayer, where the context "lead us not into the (sphere of) temptation" (let alone other internal reasons) seems to necessitate the rendering "the *evil one.*"

---

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *The Corinthians must not vex their brethren, in going to law with them:* 6 *especially under infidels.* 9 *The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* 15 *Our bodies are the members of Christ,* 19 *and temples of the Holy Ghost.* 16, 17 *They must not therefore be defiled.*

DARE any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?

---

CHAP. VI. 1–11. Christians should not sue one another before heathen tribunals: if there must needs be an appeal to law, let a Christian arbitrator be appointed to adjust the difference: much better than this, however, is to disarm litigation altogether by submitting to a wrong inflicted. What shall be said of those who, instead of *taking* wrong, *deal* wrong? Let the Church bear in mind that no evil-doers of any description shall have any lot in God's kingdom. St. Paul then, just as in ch. v. 7, mitigates his vehement corrective with an elevating reminder of the lofty moral status into which the converts were transplanted in holy baptism.

**1.** *Dare any* . . .] *Fulminat* Paulus: flash after flash of sarcastic fire and interrogative satire. "**Deigneth one of you, having a matter anent the other party, seek for judgment before the unjust?**" How truly preposterous! What a contradiction: to go to law before the lawless! to sue for right dealing before wrong-doers! What? Deigns any Christian litigant to make an appeal by legal process to a heathen tribunal? Does he not rather seek for judgment by arbitration before Christian umpires, and get a dispute of rival claims between saints adjusted by such as are saints,—men hallowed in the hallowed circle of God's kingdom and righteousness? Rank treason this to the grandeur of their future status in that kingdom! *Or* (the only alternative and

Digitized by Google

2 Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

3 Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?

4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.

---

excuse of such derogatory conduct) do ye *not know* (does not your vaunted wisdom inform you, or have ye not comprehended from the teaching of Paul or of Apollos the fact of the future) that the saints shall judge the world? If so, how can the saints ask the world to pass judgment upon them, when they shall pass judgment upon the world? The saints belong not to the *cosmos*, but, the very reverse, the *cosmos* belongs to them: see iii. 22. It is absurd in itself, and it is quite alien to the divine *idea* and counsel, that any of you should now appear at *their* bar, who shall some day appear at *yours*.

This prohibition of appeal to heathen tribunals, as Theodoret remarks, is not at variance with Rom. xiii. 1 . . . for no *resistance* to the "powers that be" is here counselled, only an abstention from seeking legal redress in Pagan law courts.

2. "**And if in your presence the world is to be judged** (present *tense of destiny*), **unmeet are ye for judgment-seats of the meanest sort?**" Are ye not good enough to sit as judges in civil causes, which by comparison are simply trivial.

A smart shock of irony runs through this argument *a majori ad minus*. Lofty irony too, blended with righteous indignation, is in most of what follows. "Do ye *not know*"—with serious banter and reiterated surprise at such ignorance behind so much profession—are ye not acquainted with another fact of the future, "that *angels* we shall judge?" Not only the world of men, but a higher class of created beings—*angels!*

N.B. Ἀγγέλους is unarticled because the *qualitative* idea of the term is made conspicuous. This view postulated by the context, is better than to say with Bp. Wordsworth and Winer that the absence of the article indicates "*some* angels of the whole number:" this idea, however true in itself it may be, is not in the text, nor may it be thus inferred: compare Hebr. ii. 16, where the anarthrous term "*angels*" is contrasted with the anarthrous term "*seed of Abraham*." Compare also ποῦ σοφός; where is wiseman?—the whole genus.

3. So far in this interesting passage all has been smooth sailing. Rocks and breakers now appear: difficult navigation, and much difference of opinion. The only safe plan is first to analyse the cardinal terms and the particles too, which are numerous and significant: and it is curious to see how the eye-words of one sentence, rightly understood, serve to illustrate the eye-words of another, and that reciprocally. This is important for the doctrine. The grammatical analysis of this intricate passage will be found in an Additional Note at the end of the chapter.

As the Authorised Version is somewhat loose in rendering these verses, which (it should be noted) ring with satire, the following retranslation, with inserted explanations, is suggested. Render and explain from ver. 1 to ver. 12:—"**Deigneth any one of you** (*you* emphatic), **having a matter anent the other (party), to seek for judgment before the wrong-doers and not before the saints?** (Are ye so besotted) **or do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if in your presence the world is to be judged, unmeet are ye to hold judge-courts of the lowest sort? Do ye not know that angels we shall judge,** angels! **Speak not of secular things! Nay rather** (that I may unmask your folly by a *reductio ad absurdum*) **if secular judge-courts ye should perchance hold** (a measure how unworthy of your kingly calling and of your future judicial status!), **take men of utterly no account in the church and set them on the bench!** (*Them*, I say, for such nonentities are equal to the settlement of such trivialities.) **To put you to shame I speak it** (this last sentence serious, not satirical). **So! is there not among you** (wisemen as you flaunt yourselves) **not even one wiseman who shall be competent to arbitrate** (give a decision) **on the part of his brother? But brother with brother goes to law** (which is a breach of charity) **and sues for judgment at the bar of unbelievers** (which is preposterous)? **Nay, verily** (let alone the absurd length of appealing to heathen men) **it is so far quite a defeat to you that you have cause for legal judgments between yourselves.** (The κρίματα to be taken with μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, see verse 6.) **Why do ye not rather take wrong** (than allow or give cause for this *ratio ultima* of legal judgment)? **Why not submit to being defrauded? Nay but** (the very reverse, so far from taking wrong dealt) **you deal wrong yourselves, and** (what makes it

Digitized by Google

5 I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?

6 But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.

7 Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather *suffer yourselves to* be defrauded?

8 Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that *your* brethren.

9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,

10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extor-

---

worse) **deal wrong to brethren!** Is this possible? **or do ye,** with all your boasted knowledge, **not know that wrong-doers** (of any sort) **shall not inherit God's kingdom?"**

In verse 3, "angels we shall judge." Whether these are good or bad angels, or both, commentators differ. Meyer and Alford say that this noun, without a defining epithet, *always* denotes good angels. This statement cannot be correct, as in this verse St. Paul, on purpose, leaves *angels* without article and without epithet, in order to make conspicuous, not their character, good or bad, but their exalted, noble *nature.* His argument is clearly ascensive from the world of human creatures to the order of angelic beings: "ye shall hold assizes upon the heathen world hereafter; are ye unfit now for the most paltry sessions? Nay, much higher: not only men, but angels shall come under your jurisdiction." The Apostle might indeed have written the "wicked world" and "evil angels:" but such epithets would have invalidated his argument. Nay more, from the fact that the world, which is to be judged in the full presence of the risen saints, will consist mainly of unbelievers or apostates, who shall have missed the Messianic salvation of the Parousia—men, that is, not redeemed from the fall—it may be fairly reasoned that St. Paul, when he speaks of angels being judged, has in his mind chiefly, if not entirely, *fallen angels,* although he does not so designate them, because such an epithet would be irrelevant and detrimental to his argument. In fact, most commentators, from Chrysostom down to Bengel, seem to think that fallen angels or demons are meant here. The correctness of this view will be strengthened when we reflect that Satan is designated both "ruler of the demons" (Matt. ix. 34, xii. 24) and "ruler of this world" (John xii. 31, xiv. 30), and moreover that the demon-powers are called (Eph. vi. 12) "the *world*-rulers of this darkness," doomed *themselves* to be deposed and with the wicked world to be judged in the great day by the enthroned Son of Man and His seated saints. It appears indeed from holy writ, that of these once angelic hierarchies different sets at different times fell from their principatus, some *before* man's creation, others *after;* to this latter fall most probably belong "the sons of God," or angels of Gen. vi. 2—(consider the τούτοις and ἑτέρας of Jude 7, and see S. T. Maitland's able essay Eruvin, pp. 125–155); who are now "in bonds of darkness, and in the Abyss kept for the assize (κρίσιν) of the great day" (2 Pet. ii. 4). Of a different class to these fallen angels is the "Satan-ruled empire of the air, a power that now worketh in the children of disobedience," Ephes. ii. 2, and "the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the *heavenly* places." Ephes. vi. 12. These demons of different dates and manifold ranks, some in the heavenlies, some in the atmosphere, some in the Abyss (called *height* and *depth,* Rom. viii. 39), are termed "angels of the devil" (Matt. xxv. 41), and it is probable that Satan himself was once an archangel. See Jude 9.

**7.** *a fault.*] ἥττημα may here mean a moral *defeat* sustained by the Christian soldier in his campaign and spiritual march for the heavenly prize of the kingly crown and judicial throne. Others make it denote *loss* or *damage* to the church, more litigant than militant, in the eyes of observant heathendom.

**9.** "Be not deceived:" solemn caution: be not misled or caught by Satan's infatuation and world-netting πλάνη.

**10.** Apoc. xii. 9; xx. 8. *Inherit the kingdom of God.*] The archetypal kingdom of God "prepared from the foundation of the world," of which the Jewish *theocracy* enlarged into the Gentile *ecclesia* is but preparatory, was announced on the change of name from Abram "high father" to Abraham "the father of a multitude or ancestor of kings and of nations;" see Keil On Pentateuch, vol. 1 Gen. xvii. The mystical Canaan, which was

Digitized by Google

tioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

11 And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

12 All things are lawful unto me,

---

promised to Abraham and his spiritual seed or collective unity of Christ and His Church, is in fact the *cosmos* (Rom. iv. 13), the glorified and transfigured world of the future. This twin world of heaven and of earth (compare "thy kingdom come, thy will be done, as in heaven, also on earth") this kingdom of unknown dimensions, comprising probably the principalities and dominions of the gradually subjugated "world rulers in the heavenly places," the saints shall inherit, i. e. shall '*hold in lots*,' shall possess in jurisdictions and governments assigned to them in proportion to their faithful service in this life. Comp. Dan. xii. 13. "Thou shalt stand in thy *lot* in the end of the days." When heaven and earth in their present *schema* or fleeting fashion shall pass away and their process of redintegration either to what they once were or to the idea of the divine archetype shall take place, then shall "the kingdom of the heavens" become the actual possession of the manifested sons of God. This glorified kingdom of the blessed Messianic Aeon (hence it is called αἰώνιος) was *assigned* by God the Father to His Incarnate Son, as the proper fruit and merited prize of His humiliation and Passion; and it was by Jesus Christ himself *assigned* to his own faithful followers, who by virtue of this διαθήκη are to reign *with* Him in the glory. See Luke xxii. 29. Among the *subjects* of this manifold Kingdom, which includes the whole creation enfranchised (Rom. viii.), will be *the nations* (cf. Rev. xxi. 24). This word βασιλεία means not only *kingdom* but also *kingship* when it denotes the regal function of the Messiah and His associated saints exercised over the future populations. When it denotes an inalienable attribute of Triune Deity it means *Majesty*. "Twofold is the Saviour's βασιλεία, the one *before* the created Aeons and without beginning, the other *with* the (Messianic) Aeon and dating from the *oeconomia*." Chrys. Hom. cv. tom. v. p. 681.

**11.** *but ye are washed.*] Render "But ye **washed away**" (your sins); not, as some, "ye washed yourselves" from your sins. It may be safely asserted that the Middle Voice is *never* directly reflexive: there is no instance in which the action of the verb is straight upon the objective reflex of the subject. Not even ἀπήγξατο means in propriety "he hanged himself."

*but ye are sanctified.*] Render "**were sanctified.**" Ἁγιάζειν = "to set apart for God." It has a negative and a positive meaning: it denotes the appropriation of persons and of things, in their measures, to divine uses. This implies alienation from the world and from sin. Thus Matt. xxiii. 17, "the shrine hallows the gold," i. e. severs it from profane uses and consecrates it to God's service. So of *persons*: in John x. 36, the Son, before He was sent into the world, was by His Father *hallowed* as the organ and minister of the divine counsel of redemption to mankind: hence also his title "the Holy One of God," Mark i. 4. In this verse the full sense is "ye were detached from the world and *dedicated to God*, the Holy Spirit also implanting in you a moral determination of will towards communion with God's holiness." As the acts of sanctification (in its germ here, not in its growth) and of justification are both on God's part simultaneous with the rite of baptism on man's, it matters little in what order the two are mentioned. "**But ye were justified.**" Meyer, "ye were made righteous." But how can δικαιοῦν possibly signify "*to make righteous?*" Verbs indeed of this ending from adjectives of *physical* meaning may have this use, e. g. τυφλοῦν "to make blind." But when such verbs are derived from adjectives of *moral* meaning, as ἀξιοῦν, ὁσιοῦν, δικαιοῦν, they do by usage and must from the nature of things signify to *deem*, to *account*, to *prove* or to *treat as* worthy, holy, righteous. Compare LXX, Book of Wisdom vi. 11: "they who have kept holy the holy statutes shall be *regarded holy*." It is after the Parousia that we shall be in St. Paul's phrase *established righteous*, Rom. v. 19: when far beyond a mere imitative obedience to God's moral law, we shall be gifted with a natural power of *living* His righteousness and of expressing it spontaneously through our threefold humanity in every thought, in every look, in every word, in every act. Meanwhile the righteousness of God, in which we shall then be set indefectible, is by grace imputed to us miserable sinners, as we by faith strive to "walk blameless before Him." In this life we are not *made* righteous.

"**In the name—and in the Spirit.**" These two *in*-clauses embrace the three preceding predicates of baptismal ablution, of consecration to God, of justification. The word *name* here, as so often in Scripture, denotes not so much *who* as *what* the owner is. It expresses the *nature* and the *relation* to the baptized of their proper Lord and

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *profitable.*

but all things are not [1]expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.

13 Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them. Now the body *is* not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body.

14 And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power.

15 Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make *them* the members of an harlot? God forbid.

16 What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh.

17 But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.

18 Flee fornication. Every sin

---

God-saviour, who delivers the *people of His earning* from their enemies and from their sins. The sense is, ye were baptized, ye were consecrated, ye were justified all in the hallowed circle of His redemptive Name (whose "name was named before the sun was made," Book of Enoch) and in the pure and light-shedding sphere of the Spirit of God.

12. "You must not abuse the doctrine of Christian allowance, O Corinthians, and suppose with Hellenic philosophy that "man is the measure of all things" and that all the creatures are his for use. It is not true, if eating and drinking, natural appetites, are things indifferent, that *sensual* appetites also are of the same category. As to myself, if I may speak representatively, all indifferent things are to me allowable, but not all are advantageous for others: for, what may not be wrong in itself, is not always profitable or conducive to the common weal: my actions shall not be my masters. There is a play of words in the second clause, "I am master of all things, it is true, but not *I* will be mastered by any," lest the service which is "perfect freedom" become bondage and my Christian liberty moral slavery.

13. Moreover, O Corinthians, you cannot argue from the natural to the sensual, that as the belly is for meats so the body is for fornication; both esculents and their assimilating continents are things indifferent, being perishable and not reaching into eternity, and their mutual adaptation shall in time cease: but the body is not for fornication, as the belly for meats, but for the Lord, and the Lord is for the body; and this mutual adaptation shall not cease for ever, for God will raise us from the dead, as He raised the Lord, and so the body surviving the Parousia shall be transfigured into a holy instrument for the work of the Lord in the kingdom of God.

15-17. "Your *bodies* are *members of Christ*—he that is joined to the Lord is *one spirit.*" Profound and cogent dissuasive from the deadly sin of fornication. Our physical bodies are members mystical of Christ's Body mystical: these many members are not vivified by so many individual spirits, but all by one spirit breathed from the one Head through the one Body of many members. So that in a mystical manner we are organically set in Him, and He spiritually breathes in us: and, to borrow His own metaphor, we are in Christ, as the branches are in the vine; and Christ is in us, as the sap of the vine is in the branches. One and the same sap from the root permeates and vivifies the stem and the boughs. In like manner one and the same Spirit from the Head circulates in continuity through all the many myriads of living members. Hence, as the Humanity of Christ expands and embodies fresh saints, these spiritually live not so many individual and mutually independent lives, but one communicated life, which moreover not so much *they* live, as Christ lives it in them, who Himself is therefore called "our life:" even as the nervous energy from the brain penetrates every limb and joint of our frame. A finger cut off from the hand, or a hand from the arm, or an arm from the body, dies, having no life in itself. Thus "he who is joined to the Lord" is, in his own measure of capacity, one Spirit with Him, just as the animal life of the finger is one with the owner's. But he who commits fornication kills in himself the spiritual life of Christ; and, except he repent, is lopped off like a rotten branch from the vine. It may be added that the one Spirit of the one Body is called sometimes the "Spirit of God," sometimes the "Spirit of Christ," because it is within the Humanity of the Son of Man that the Holy Spirit operates.

If ἄρας = *tollens*, "should I take away?" then the sense is, What you think your own, is another's by right of creation and by right of redemption. If you take away from Him what is His, you rob Him; and if you apply to a purpose of your own that which is not yours, you are guilty of malappropriation.

18. *Flee fornication.*] "*Resist* the devil,

Digitized by Google

that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.

19 What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost *which is* in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?

20 For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

---

and he will flee from you," but fornication *flee* and *flee* (imperf. imperat.): in this instance you conquer by running away. Of the next sentence the ordinary interpretation is unsatisfactory: "other sins are committed externally," *Jerome;* "every other sin works upon the body from without," *Meyer;* and so nearly all, referring the "every other sin" to gluttony or drunkenness. But where in the Greek text is the word corresponding to *other?* Nowhere: nor can the missing link fairly be supplied from a context that *follows.* The true contrast seems to be, not between gluttony or drunkenness, as shafts of sin missing the body, and harlotry, as an arrow hitting the body, but rather between incidental or exceptional sins in general and the habit of fornication in special. This view is probable, not only from the absence of the ἄλλο, but for other linguistic reasons, not to mention that on ethical grounds drunkenness and gluttony are vices that *do hit* the body.

N.B. In the first and subordinate clause ποιήσῃ is the *aorist*, while in the principal clause πορνεύων is in the *imperfect* or tense of habit: and as ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν = "to put forth in practice the principle of sin," or to sin habitually, so ἁμάρτημα ποιῆσαι = "to do a sinful *act*." The ὃ ἐάν=not, as some, *whatsoever* (need of ὅτι ἄν for that), but "that perchance." Comp. Acts. ii. 21: πᾶς ὃς ἐάν "*any* one who *may* call upon . . . ." Ἄνθρωπος, instead of τις, seems to import a faint hue of human infirmity.

The sense then is, Flee and flee the vice of fornication: any act of sin in general that (frail) man may commit, outside the body falls, and fails to hit it: but the fornicator does against his own body sin. A contrast here between ἐκτός and εἰς. If this view be right, no palliation here of single sins must be thought of. Compare 1 John ii. 1: ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ, "if any one *commit a sin*, we have an Advocate." How perilous single sins are, link after link nimbly weaving a silent chain that steals around and coils fast the captive of Satan, see Jeremy Taylor, vol. ii. p. 481. Such a clause would simply serve to keep open the door of repentance to such neophytes as had fallen unawares into carnal sin in voluptuous Corinth, where the lenient view, bred in the heathen bone, of the coarser vices lingered long.

The fornicator, I say, hits his own body in the vice of harlotry. Are you still so heathen in the grain as to deem the body an *organon adiaphoron?* Is it possible? "*Or* do ye *not know* that the body of you (as saints) is the shrine of the Holy Spirit that is in you (as saints)?" Fornication is a *desecration*, for it defiles that which is hallowed: it is rebellion also, and that against God: for you with your bodies are *His* property, His *peculium:* ye are not your own. For ye were *bought* . . . .

20. Idea twofold: these words should be read, not in continuity, but with a break: "ye were *purchased*—with a *price*." No epithet to *price:* it requires none: it is the *blood* of Christ. This price was paid, not as some early Fathers say, to Satan, but to God, and to Him in order to meet exactly the demands of His *righteousness*, i.e. harmony of action with His own absolute law: "for without bloodshedding, no remission." It is the "*precious* blood" of our Litany, inasmuch as the human blood of the Eternal God was the ransom paid to God for our eternal redemption from the curse of the Law and from the wrath of God and from the claims of Satan and from the power of Sin. "*Do just* glorify God." The δή cannot mean *therefore:* it is a subjective particle = *just* or *now*. By one effort (*Aor.* imperative) "do just glorify God in the shrine of the body," for it is a very sanctuary of the Holy Ghost.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 3 and verses ff.

The word κριτήριον means neither "judgment" nor "trial," but in propriety a "judge's seat" or "judge's court" or "place of session." And this proper meaning just suits these texts, in which a contrast is intended between the tribunal or βῆμα of the heathen magistrates, constituted by Roman authority, and the possible but not yet established bench of a Christian arbitrator, who may amicably settle private lawsuits between Christians. This, as contrasted with the Roman βῆμα or raised platform with its proconsular *sella*, is here termed κριτήριον, a word which means not precisely judgment-seat, for the idea of a

Digitized by Google

*person* or persons judging lurks in the etymon κριτής: in like manner εὐναστήριον means not a "sleeping place" so much as "*a sleeper's chamber*," and θυσιαστήριον means the "altar of a *sacrificing priest*." This is true of very many such words, even in Æschylus, Choëphoroe 5 and 6. In the word *psaltery* lurks the harper and in the *Psalter* the Psalmist. When the term in question is used in a figurative sense, even then the image of νοῦς seated as κριτής seems to come to view: Plato Theaet. 178, B. This idea of a personal judge lurking in the word is doctrinally important, because when St. Paul wrote κρινοῦμεν, an image of the Apostles and saints seated on thrones reigning and judging with Christ (see Matt. xix. 28, Dan. vii., Rev. xx. 4) may have flitted through his mind and suggested the coming term κριτηρίων. If so, the noun substantive throws back light upon the verb, and assigns to it the proper sense of *judging*. This more accurate view disperses the notion of *condemnation*, negative, comparative, moral, which some eminent scholars attach to the word, e. g. Bp. Wordsworth *in loco*, who however appositely cites Barrow, Sermon 33, "The Saints being *first approved* shall *become assessors*," i. e. according to the Pauline teaching, first approved before the *bema* or tribunal of Christ (2 Cor. v. 10) they shall afterwards, with Son of man enthroned supreme, reign upon the earth and judge the nations. For this word κρίνειν in its ampler sense denotes also regal jurisdiction and administrative government of *polities* allotted to the saints in the Messianic Kingdom. See Parable of the Talents and the Book of Judges *passim*; Book of Wisdom iii. 8, 9; Apocal. ii. 26. This noun κριτήριον occurs once again in the New Testament, James ii. 6, where it is translated "judgment-seat," and it occurs some six times in the Septuagint in the same or like sense; in Dan. vii. 10. "The judgment was set;" where it seems to denote the collective *bench* of judges: cp. verse 9, "the thrones were set." So πειρατήριον in Plutarch means (1) a resort or nest (2) a gang of pirates.

The next word is κρίνεσθαι, and it means "to seek for judgment" or "sue for a judicial decision;" some render it "to go to law." Quite different from κρίνεσθαι is κρίματα ἔχειν of verse 7. *Cremer* renders it "to have lawsuits" or "legal proceedings," curiously making this a *fourth* meaning of the phrase in order to oblige this particular passage. Alford, "to have matters of dispute;" rather πράγματα to express that thought. Meyer, "to have legal judgments already obtained," which cannot be right, inasmuch as it breaks the logical connection: κρίματα must mean "judgments" or "judicial decisions;" and if we translate ἔχειν "to have grounds for" (compare Rom. iv. 2) or even, the idea of the verb passing from the subject to the object, as it so often does, "to furnish occasions for" (see Thucyd. ii. 42), we shall obtain a sense precisely in logical keeping with what follows. Perhaps "to have cases for legal judgment" may hit the mark: (or possibly "to admit of, allow judgments at law." Comp. Latin, Res controversiam *habet*).

As to the particles, which have much weight in determining the logical sequence, three of them must be briefly discussed, μήτιγε, μὲν οὖν, ἤδη. Μήτιγε equals *nedum*, and means "much more" or "much less," according to the context. But neither "much more" nor "much less" is the *essential* sense of the phrase. The intrinsic meaning is "let me not speak of," or rather "don't mention;" "utter not in the same breath what is out of the question." Perhaps here "let alone secular matters"—"not a word about seculars." And the Apostle probably intended this essential sense to stand out in the foreground, not so as to exclude altogether the circumstantial also, but to throw it comparatively into the shade. If this be true, the mark of interrogation should be put after κρινοῦμεν and a colon or full stop after βιωτικά, and the full sense will be:—"Let alone seculars, of course: there is no question but that secular causes come easily within the scope of your judicial decisions, but, as such, they are trivialities far beneath your dignity. What? stoop to such base benches of judgment? when *angels* shall appear on their trial before *you*, seated on your thrones?"

As regards μὲν οὖν, so variously rendered here, it often signifies "*nay verily*, *nay more*, *nay rather*," or "*yea rather*," according as it is corrective and substitutive of a new thought (as Soph. Ajax, 1363) or confirmative of what has been stated and addititious (as Plato, Phædr. 230, A.). The οὖν *may* signify "then" or "therefore"—as indeed several take it here—*only* when the μέν falls back upon the preceding word, because it is expectant of a coming δέ or ἀτάρ (as Eur. Hipp. 1249): but that is precisely *not* the case here in either instance, for βιωτικά looks forward to no corresponsive antithesis and ἤδη again for the same reason is not a word with which μέν (with an οὖν in front of it) can well associate: the μέν, therefore, must coalesce with the οὖν in both instances.

But the most difficult particle is the ἤδη: commentators seem to make it mean *already*, or simply overlook it. The word happens to be a key-word: clearly it has a logical sense here, not temporal, and means *so far* or *up to this point*: Thucyd. κατ' ἔχθος ἤδη "with a feeling akin or amounting to hate;" and Demosthenes, De Corona, ἤδη πέντε. In fact

Digitized by Google

ἤδη prepares the way for ὅτι, and points forward to it as a finger-post or a demonstrative (= καὶ τοῦτο), and the full sense is, "Sue for judgment at the bar of *unbelievers*? Nay rather, *so far* it is absolutely a defeat to you *that* ye have cases for judgment between yourselves:" or more expanded still, "Let alone your going to law, which is bad; and let alone your going to law before unbelievers, which is intolerable, quite enough to constitute a defeat for you is the fact of your furnishing moral grounds for legal decisions between yourselves; in other words, the fact of your doing wrong at all and so opening a door to litigation: of course your appeal to Roman tribunals in affairs of litigation is something worse than a mere defeat: that amounts to a surrender of your future rights when the saints κρινοῦσιν ἔθνη καὶ κρατήσουσιν λεῶν" (Wisdom iii. 9).

There is one more phrase which has been misunderstood. Ἀνὰ μέσον *cannot* here signify "between." rather it means "*on behalf of* his brother," "on behalf of" in the sense of *ex parte*. Comp. LXX *passim* and 3 Reg. V. 12, where it means literally "there was peace halfway from Hiram and halfway from Solomon," i.e. the two radii from the two kings on the circumference meeting in the centre, there was peace the whole diameter between them. See also Genesis xvii. 2.

The last but least difficulty in this difficult passage is the much controverted mood of καθίζετε in verse 4. Some twenty eminent commentators make it the indicative, putting a mark of interrogation after the verb. Surely this view is on logical grounds quite untenable, and on grammatical very questionable; for the protatic clause with ἐάν, pointing to something in the future, requires that the verb in the apodosis be in the future tense or (which is the same thing grammatically) in the imperative mood, for this implies future action: and for the obvious reason that what is contingent upon a condition cannot take place before that also takes place which conditions it. Now it is evident, from the lights which the eyewords of this whole passage reflect upon each other, that the Apostle intends to discriminate between the established Roman *bema* in Corinth, to which Christian litigants had resorted for adjustment of suits (witness the twice-occurring ἐπί, and compare for this use of ἐπί Acts of Apostles *passim*), and between the not yet constituted *criteria* or possible benches of Christian arbitrators. This being true, logic and grammar alike make it imperative that καθίζετε be in the imperative. Moreover, how can the phrase "them who are least esteemed in the Church" denote, as Meyer insists, the *outside heathen*? What an elaborate and artificial designation of them instead of the usual and simple τοὺς ἔξω! The true translation is, "persons of utterly *no* account in the Church—set these on the bench:" *these*, I say, for such human *ciphers* within the pale are quite good enough to settle within the pale such paltry disputes, such mere *biotics* as petty wranglings about *meum* and *tuum!* Meyer's objection to this view is that a second τούς would be needed before the phrase "in the Church:" this objection is simply futile: even from his own stand-point the τούς ought to be τῶν; else it would divide the "despised ones" into two classes, one outside the Church, the other inside. We should bear in mind that nearly all these verses ring with satire. The τούτους of verse 4 has a deep bass of emphatic sarcasm.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

2 *He treateth of marriage,* 4 *shewing it to be a remedy against fornication:* 10 *and that the bond thereof ought not lightly to be dissolved.* 18, 20 *Every man must be content with his vocation.* 25 *Virginity wherefore to be embraced.* 35 *And for what respects we may either marry, or abstain from marrying.*

NOW concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me: *It is* good for a man not to touch a woman.

---

CHAP. VII. Could we see the letter of questions sent to St. Paul by the Corinthians, a new light would be shed upon his replies in this chapter, to us somewhat obscure. The letter is lost, but some of the questions, we may infer from the answers, were (1) Is marriage, where there is no engagement, a thing to be desired or to be avoided, under the pressure of such times, the shadow of the looming Parousia? (2) Where a man and a woman are married or engaged, is the bond to be dissolved, if one of the two be an unbeliever? (3) What about the question of celibacy and virginity? Is a widow also at liberty to marry again? This is a chapter of *casuistries* or questions upon special *cases* submitted to the Apostle's judgment. St. Paul writes his answers as if he thought that all relations of life were just now of a very precarious tenure, for the times were straitening, persecutions were threatening, the earthly theo-

Digitized by Google

2 Nevertheless, *to avoid* fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

3 Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.

4 The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

5 Defraud ye not one the other, except *it be* with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.

6 But I speak this by permission, *and* not of commandment.

7 For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.

8 I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I.

---

cracy was swiftly tending to dissolution and to a heavenly supersession. The Apostle's advice contains rather precepts for the time than counsels for the centuries: and their adaptation admits of elasticity. It may be added that in this chapter the Greek text has been tampered with; ascetic tendencies have led to arbitrary corrections.

1. *It is good for a man.*] The much discussed word for 'good' (καλόν) here appears to mean, not exactly *morally good* as set against a contrary that is *morally evil*, but rather something which affords a *position* for attaining to a higher religious level and to more singleness of heart in serving the Lord. It points to condition or circumstance, yet to such happy circumstance as leads to moral and spiritual improvement. It seems to be used here, and in verses 8 and 26, in much the same sense as in the texts, "It is *good* for us to be here," and "It were *good* for that man had he never been born;" as we say, "a *capital* thing," "a *fine* thing," "an *excellent* thing." Indeed *Jerome* here does render it "excellent." This view of the word is rather countenanced by the phrases, "This I say for your own *interest*" in verse 35, and "*happier* is she if she so abide" in verse 40. Render here, "**It is an excellent thing for man** in general" not ἀνδρί).

2. "**Yet on account of the fornications**" (that are too rife in Corinth).

N.B. Διά "to avoid." A. V. Most important it is to mark well this *terse* yet *elastic* use of prepositions. Comp. xv. 29 "baptized *for* the dead," and a mistranslated text in Coloss. ii. 23, οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι πρὸς πλησμονὴν σαρκός, where it has long seemed to me that a more accurate and sensible rendering would be "not of any *value to check* the gratification of the flesh;" for here πρός = "to meet;" whether with a view of checking or of aiding, the context determines. Cf. LXX, Ps. lxviii. 22. "They gave me vinegar for drink (with an eye) *unto* my thirst," *i. e.* to slake it. Sometimes πρός = "to meet" with a sense of *furthering*, as in this chap. ver. 35 and Heb. ix. 13; so that the same preposition with different surroundings may have precisely opposite meanings; the essential sense, however, is always an invariable quantity.

3. "Due benevolence," A. V. Rather *debitum tori*. The correct reading is τὴν ὀφειλήν.

4. "Hath not *power* over *her own* body." This Bengel calls a charming paradox. A very similar one see in Aristoph. Plutus, verses 4, 5.

> τοῦ σώματος γὰρ οὐκ ἐᾷ τὸν κύριον
> κρατεῖν ὁ δαίμων ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐωνημένον.

5. Render:—"**unless ye should perchance** appoint a mutual abstention **by agreement for a season, that you may get a leisure time** (aorist) **for prayer,**" *i. e.* for the special devotion you may contemplate (*fasting and* should be expunged from the text) "and that (when the special season has elapsed) you may be together again, as usual, and no longer keep asunder, lest Satan should proceed to tempt you because of your lack of self-control:" an infirmity of the blood, on which the tempter would keep his eye and try to inflame it into a breach of the marriage vow.

6, 7. **This** (contents of verse 5) **I say by way of allowance** to you, **not by way of injunction**; you must use your own discretion, whether you keep apart by mutual consent at all or, if so, how long. This depends in a measure on idiosyncrasies; all men are not, as I am myself, gifted with continence. I *do wish* they were.

8. "If *they* also abide, as I" (*i. e.* to the end of life, *Aorist*). Not "*even as* I," A. V. Our idiom requires that the *also* be transferred from the protatic into the principal clause: cf. Œdip. Col. ὥσπερ με κἀνεστήσαθ', ὧδε σώσατε. This is frequent.

Digitized by Google

9 But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.

10 And unto the married I command, *yet* not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from *her* husband:

11 But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to *her* husband: and let not the husband put away *his* wife.

12 But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away.

13 And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him.

14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the un-

---

**9.** It is an excellent, a fine thing, if they abide in livelong continence; "**yet, if they have** *not* self-control (middle voice of *moral powers*), let them **marry at once**; for it is better to marry at once than to burn on" (Aor. and Imperf. Infin). See note at the end of the chapter shewing the incorrectness of the rendering:—"if they are incontinent."

**10.** "**To the married** (man and wife both Christian) **give I orders, not I, but the Lord.**" No question here of Apostolic inspiration. Nothing is clearer than that St. Paul wrote in general under inspiration; he declares this, as far as a man may do so about himself, in verse 40. There were times indeed when he was pre-eminently inspired: when his spirit swelled and teemed with superabounding revelations, *not all* of which his pen was permitted to transcribe. In this verse he simply cites the weightier testimony of the divine Master: for he knew by the living voice of tradition what command Christ had given concerning divorce Matt. xix. 3–9, Mark x. 2–12. Hence the potent word παραγγέλλω, I pass on the order,—the word of the Lord. Render with parenthetical clause, "**To the married pass I the order, not I, but the Lord, that wife from husband be not parted** (if however she *should* be parted, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband), **and that husband abandon not wife,**" lit. "do not let go wife."

**12—16.** Case of *mixed* marriages.

**To the rest** (such as were *converted in wedlock*) **say I** (from my Apostolic inspiration), **not the Lord** (His divine authority did not by word of mouth pronounce upon this question), **if any brother has for wife an unbeliever and she agrees with him in thinking it well to dwell with him, let him not abandon her, and** (as to) **wife, if any has for husband an unbeliever and he agrees with her in thinking well to dwell with her . . .** γυνή precedes ἥτις for sake of contrast with *brother* of verse 12: the εἰ implied in ἥτις (= εἴ τις) covers two clauses. By Greek and Roman law the *wife* could procure a divorce.

**14.** Ground of the foregoing precept: "**The** *husband* **that is an unbeliever is sanctified** by union with the *wife*;" i.e. is externally sanctified. His status is a hallowed status (see note on vi. 11). For he dwells no longer in the profane and godless world, but stands upon the sacred threshold of the Church. Both he and his wife are in God's commonwealth: she incorporated, he merely attached: her's is a dedication of self, his a consecration of position: his *surroundings* only are hallowed: brought out of the darkness he is in the light, but the light is not in him. United to a saintly consort he is in daily contact with saintly conduct: holy association may become holy assimilation, and the sanctity which ever environs may at last penetrate; for it is drop upon drop that hollows the rock and makes it a cistern: the *circumstances* are such that the man's will may be reached by God's grace which by a divine law moves in the sphere of theocratic consecration. But the man's *conversion* is not a condition necessary to the sanctity of the subsisting conjugal union; and Bengel seems, as usual, to hit the mark when he writes, "Sanctificatus est, ut pars fidelis (uxor) *sancte uti* possit neque divellere debeat:" cf. 1 Tim. iv. 5. This being true, the children of a Christian wife and a non-Christian husband, being the children of a hallowed union, are themselves hallowed, i.e. in a position meet for dedication to God's service in holy baptism. All this however holds good of such marriages as were contracted before the conversion of one of the two consorts. Chrysostom well remarks on the second instance of this verse, that a man may put away his wife neither for unbelief nor for idolatry, but for fornication, because she has become a harlot, and he that is one body with a harlot is polluted. "Else *were*:" *are* more correct: "**since (otherwise) of course,**" or "**else of course, the children of you** (who belong to this class of unequal pairs) **are uncleansed,** i.e. to God from the defile-

Digitized by Google

believing wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

15 But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such *cases:* but God hath called us [1] to peace.

[1] Gr. *in peace.*

16 For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save *thy* husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save *thy* wife?

17 But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches.

18 Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.

19 Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the

---

ments of the world, **but now you see** (it being a *fact*, made known to me, that one unbelieving consort is hallowed by contact with the other who has been converted) **the children are holy;**" i.e. hallowed in their outward estate, just as the unbelieving parent is, and open to the inner consecration of the Holy Spirit. It is not easy to sound the deeper sense of this. We may imagine three concentric circles; the innermost circle of spiritual light, environed by a margin of theocratic twilight, the suburbs of the city of God: embracing this twofold sphere is the immense margin of outer cosmic darkness. Better the twilight than the outer darkness, for it is a state of hope and transition from the bad to the good, and one that furnishes opportunities of grace, and makes salvation accessible. The deeper causes of these boundary lines lie in the secret laws of the divine government of the universe and in the unknown partition of mundane realms among angels and spirits, good and evil: the consecration of places, of churches, of graveyards, has a deep significance.

15. *But if the unbelieving depart.*] "**But if the unbeliever is for parting, let him part:**" the Apostle grants separation in such a case. Sense is: if the *unbeliever* be intolerant of the new religion in his converted wife, let him proceed to separate: the *Christian* partner need not be troubled thereat: *not enslaved*, not in a state of matrimonial servitude is a brother or sister in cases like this: *true:* yet (corrective δέ) to be in a state of peace God has *called* us: 'tis to live in the moral element of peace that God has called us to His Kingdom of peace, and conjugal amity, if it accord with Christian liberty, is more in keeping with our holy calling; for what dost thou know about it, wife, whether thou shalt convert and save thy husband? an event quite possible if he abide with thee: the chances are even: his conversion just lies within the circumstances.

N.B. This ancient view seems better than the more modern one of Lyra, which breaks the rule that the causal particle γάρ properly points to the nearest preceding sentence, unless there be some obvious reason for its overleap backward to the penultimate: here such obvious reason does not exist. Moreover Lyra's view maintained by Meyer and Alford and others, hardly stands the test, when it postulates εἰ μή for εἰ as necessary to establish a probability of conversion, "How knowest thou whether thou shalt not save:" for the idea of probability is not demanded by the argument here: that of *possibility* is quite enough, for it just suits the logic, which only asks that the two scales of conversion and of non-conversion be in equipoise, and this notion lies in the Greek τί οἶδας εἰ σώσεις. Compare Eur. οὐκ οἶδ' ἂν εἰ πείσαιμι, πειρᾶσθαι δὲ χρή, "I know not whether I *can* persuade, yet try I must."

17. Much controverted is the connection of the elliptical εἰ μή. Perhaps the best ellipse is, 'If the unbeliever wishes to part from the Christian consort on the ground of religious differences and there is no prospect of peace and unity, in such cases I grant permission; I give no injunction, *unless* it be in the *general* rule, Let every one walk in the lot of life which God has apportioned to him, let every one abide in that station within which the Lord has called him to the kingdom. *Here* I *ordain*, and to the churches *all* I *ordain* this.' The last word is a word of Apostolic authority. More literally, "**Only** let every one, *as* God assigned to him (some time before his conversion) his portion in this life, *so* walk." ἐμέρισεν means not "distributed" but "**apportioned.**" See Chap. i. 13. In verses 15–24 this general principle is inculcated: Let all existing relations of life, domestic social religious, be respected, when they can be respected without loss of Christian liberty and without breach of the divine laws.

18. Religious status at the time of the divine call to be retained. "**In circumcision was any one called?**" Circumcised was a man at the time of his call?

19. "Keeping of the commandments of



Digitized by Google

keeping of the commandments of God.

20 Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.

21 Art thou called *being* a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use *it* rather.

22 For he that is called in the Lord, *being* a servant, is the Lord's [1]freeman: likewise also he that is called, *being* free, is Christ's servant.

[1] Gr. *made free.*

23 Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.

24 Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God.

---

God" is *everything:* "everything" to be supplied from the contextual "nothing:" see iii. 7. Compare for parallels in doctrine Gal. v. 6, vi. 15, from all which put together it appears that the counsel of redemption willed from eternity by the *Triune* Deity, in its historical evolution in time and in its actual application to men, is threefold (1) the *new creation* by the Holy Spirit founded in baptism, (2) *faith* in Jesus Christ *working by love*, (3) the aim and goal of the whole manifold wisdom—the *keeping of the commandments of God* the Father.

**20.** Not in the essence, but in the circumstance of the divine calling. *Atmospheric* use of the preposition: comp. Hebr. v. σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου = "to keep safe out of the reach of death." Full sense is, 'In the secular surroundings of the divine calling in which (surroundings) he was called, in these let him abide.' Before ᾗ repeat ἐν and compare Thucyd. i. 1 ad fin. with Shilleto's note.

**21.** Render:—"**In slavery wast thou called? never mind; but still if thou canst also become free, rather make use of it** (than not)." Avail thyself of the power or opportunity of becoming free. For the defence of this rendering see Additional Note at end of chapter.

**22.** "**For he who being a slave was called to be in the Lord, is a freedman of the Lord,**" and consequently, if such a one is a freedman in divine relations, how much more may he become one in human relations, if but the lawful door of manumission be opened to him! Certainly let him avail himself of such an opportunity, should it occur; if, however, it should *not* occur, let him abide in his lot, happy in the assurance that man's servant for a time he is Christ's freedman for ever. "**In like manner,**" as the secular slave is a spiritual freedman, so the *secular freeman* (not *freedman*) who was called to the kingdom in union with Christ, is a spiritual slave. Such a one is not his own master (bad for him if he were): he is a moral bondsman belonging to Him "whose service is perfect freedom." This is true of you all: for all of you, whether social slaves or social freemen, are the purchased possession of one divine Master: "**with a price were ye bought** to be *His* slaves: **become not the slaves of men.**" Rather obscure is this last clause: some see in the word *men* a reference to Apollos and Cephas: *alii alia.* The sense of this verse more fully is: The converted slave, if he fail of civil enfranchisement, should console his bondage with the thought that he has received a far nobler emancipation in the divine manumission from the hard taskmastership of Satan and of sin: and the converted freeman should bear in mind that he is the personal property and future *peculium* of Him who paid the price in the blood of the cross.

**24** "In what state of life he was called to be a brother, in that let everyone abide on the side of God" who called him. If he changes the outward lot of the inward call he breaks the general rule and order of the divine government, and so far is not on the side of God, but rather deserts to the side of the world.

A brief summary of the principles laid down from vers. 15–24. "Let everyone abide in the domestic and social and religious status in which the divine call found him." To this general principle two limitations or correctives are applied (1) in verse 15 in matrimonial cases of separation, *if necessary*, "*yet* rather to be in peace and amity hath God called us;" (2) in verse 21, in social cases of servitude, which is a state of life to be cheerfully tolerated and not to be minded forsooth, "*still* if one is *able* to become free, rather let him make his escape from slavery by such a door." Again this thin vein of wholesome exception comes to view a third time in the words "*become* not slaves of men": whatever that may mean: possibly it may merely adumbrate the truly Pauline idea that personal liberty, if the law of the land permit, should go hand in hand with moral freedom; since Christianity redeems the *homo integer*, *body* as well as soul and spirit. In the Roman Empire A.D. 57 a large portion of mankind was in a state of hopeless slavery, embruted under despotic rule: so Schaff, 'History of Christian Church,' vol. i. p. 316, who quotes Gibbon, estimating the number of slaves at full one half of the 120 millions of the imperial population.

Digitized by Google

25 Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.

26 I suppose therefore that this is good for the present [1]distress, *I say*, that *it is* good for a man so to be.

[1] Or, *necessity*.

27 Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.

28 But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

---

These slaves were regarded as cattle: Schaff, ibidem. See Allard, Les Esclaves chrétiens. Manumission then must have been a boon even to a Christian even in civilized Corinth, and we cease to wonder at the corrective clause "If thou *canst* become free, rather *do so*."

**25-40.** It is obvious in these verses that St. Paul gives not an inspiration but an opinion, and an opinion to be estimated by the worth of his own Christian character. He seems to suggest measures which he considers *good* and salutary under the circumstances of an impending crisis. He does not insist upon the general moral superiority of celibacy to matrimony but states his own view that just now in a time of straitness celibacy is *better* than matrimony, that it is a state more conducive to well-being, inasmuch as it delivers from domestic distractions and facilitates a less divided and more devoted service to the Lord, whose advent is imminent. He writes as a casuist and therefore is obliged, in stating general rules, to modify their application in special instances: hence the frequent corrective δέ = *yet* or *however*. It is clear enough that the precepts here laid down are not intended to be binding on all ages of the Church, but to have an elastic adaptation, more or less stringent, according to the pressure of the times. The Greek of these verses is of such a character that it is often difficult to elicit the exact idea that was in the Apostle's mind: but that the general drift of the whole passage is as above stated, seems to admit of no doubt.

**25.** Render:—"**Concerning virgins** (not, as some, unmarried persons of both sexes, but maidens) **injunction of the Lord have I none; an opinion however I offer, as one graced with mercy to be faithful.**" His own trustworthiness St. Paul here bases upon the mercy of Christ shown to him in his conversion and calling to the Apostolate. The infinitive *to be faithful* marks one of the lines on which the mercy moves, precisely as in our Litany, "to endue us with the grace of thy Holy Spirit *to amend* our lives," the special grace is indicated which gives an impulse to amendment of life.

**26.** Many interpretations of this perplexing verse. One thing seems likely, that the τοῦτο points forward to the ὅτι, which defines. No commentator here apparently makes a distinction between εἶναι and ὑπάρχειν. This last word is difficult; it seems to mean sometimes "to be originally," "to be substantially or fundamentally" or, as in Demosthenes, "to be stored in readiness." An idea of *propriety* sometimes attaches to it: comp. ὕπαρξις "property" or "substance." The word however asks for further investigation. Here the meaning may be "**I consider then this to be an excellent principle,** or good fundamental rule, **in view of the straitness now imminent,** namely **that an excellent thing it is for a person to be thus.**" But what is the meaning of *to be thus?* Some explain "to be as he is;" others "to be as *I* am;" others "to be as the *virgins* are" i.e. unmarried. None of these explanations are quite satisfactory. A better way perhaps would be, as τοῦτο points forward to the following ὅτι, so to make οὕτως point forward to the following sentence or sentences and indicate their didactic contents (for construction comp. ix. 3), for the expressly preceptive clearly commences with verse 27 and continues long.

**27.** Direct precepts fingerpointed by the *thus* of verse 26. "Bound to a wife art thou? Married? Seek not release. Loose (*perfect* denotes *state* of exemption simply) or free from a wife art thou? Bachelor or widower? Seek not a wife: **if however thou do marry** (the future in the protasis swiftly to the writer's mind becomes the past in the apodosis), **thou sinnedst not.**" The rendering of some "If also thou shalt have married" is to be avoided, as being incorrect and uncouth and not true to the aorist, which here denotes an action begun, continued and ended. For this use of ἐὰν καί compare εἰ καὶ δύνασαι verse 21. It may also be rendered "if thou *shouldst* marry," never "if thou *shalt* marry:" quite different.

**28.** "And if the virgin should marry, she sinned not." Again St. Paul, as he writes of a marriage possible in the future, looks back upon it as a fact accomplished, when he describes its moral character. "*Afflictions*, however, *qua* the flesh shall such people have:"



Digitized by Google

29 But this I say, brethren, the time *is* short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none;

30 And they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not;

31 And they that use this world, as not abusing *it*: for the fashion of this world passeth away.

---

i. e. in such marriages there is *no sin*: only in a crisis like this they are not καλόν τι, but *adverse to well-being*. Those who marry, circumstances allowing or demanding, do not sin, it is true: yet material afflictions, such as domestic sufferings, penury, nakedness, maltreatment, spoliation, banishment, they shall not escape in the squeeze and crush of the coming struggle. *The flesh* here denotes not the ethical but material relations of life: it is the dative of department or locative: comp. 1 Peter iii. 18, "put to death *qua* flesh, quickened *qua* spirit," i. e. the spirit of His Humanity. "*I* however am for sparing you" these afflictions: the very aim of my offered opinion is to save you from the sharp disasters that will beset the married state in the pinching stress of the coming time: ἀνάγκη from ἄγχω: Lat. *nec*essitas (?)

29-31. "*This* however I affirm, *brethren*, **the time** (καιρός is to χρόνος what the aorist is to the imperfect; it denotes a time regarded as definite or bounded at both ends; whether long or short, circumstances determine; here it means "the time of acceptance" or "day of salvation") **is straitened in what is left** (of it).

*it remaineth.*] A. V. not right. The τὸ λοιπόν = not "henceforth," as many, but *what remains* of the *time* from the present hour: it denotes the limits within which the straitening takes place, the curtailment of the last reach of time. *Straitened* = "contracted" or perhaps *shrunken* or *shrivelled*, 2 Macc. vi. 12 and Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1417. The word is by Diod. Siculus applied to the dwindling or shrinking of the Nile waters, and in Acts App. v. 6, it seems to mean *packed*. Some take τὸ λοιπόν with ἵνα: if so the rendering must be, not "it remains that," but "what remains is that they who have wives *be* as . . . ," ἵνα being purely *definitive*. If however we render, "The time is straitened in what remains," ἵνα surely cannot signify, as nearly all the expositors insist, *in order that*, denoting "the divine counsel in shortening the time." For is it probable that a state of sitting loose to worldly interests should be described as the aim or purpose of God in curtailing the season of the great tribulation? This might be a divine motive for the terrors and portents of the last time being lengthened, hardly for the last time itself being shortened. Again, is it probable that St. Paul should assign such a motive for the curtailment, when evidently he is merely giving an opinion or making an assertion *of his own*, not recording a divine inspiration? This error of "the only right view of ἵνα," as it has been called, arises from a too restricted view of the uses of ἵνα: in fact ἵνα, like our *that*, has three uses: *final* (in order that he may go), *definitive* (I advise that he go), *subjectively ecbatic* ("have they stumbled that they should fall").

This last use, denoting a *contemplated moral result*, surely is the right one here, as the judicious Bengel saw when he wrote *ejusmodi ut*, i. e. *reason enough* "that they who have wives should be as . . ." Render then, "**The time is straitened in its residue, so that they who have wives should be as men having none, and they who weep as weeping not, and they who purchase as men not holding fast their gains, and they who use the world as men not overusing it, or using it to the full.**"

31. "For passing away is the fashion of this world;" or it may be, "Pass away doth," the present tense of destiny. Most expositors make these words refer to that mighty revolution of things, herald of the Parousia, which St. Paul deemed to be imminent. The ordinary illustration "is being changed as a passing *scene in a play*" is not a true one in itself: besides it misleads, as tending to confuse *scena* with *schema*. *Schema* means fleeting *fashion* and belongs to accident or circumstance: it differs from *form* or lasting shape proper to the *essence* which it represents. For example, a tree wears its *winter fashion* when it is a skeleton of bare boughs, its summer fashion when it flourishes in full leaf: the *form* of the tree however remains the same, and the substance too. In this instance, the fashion of the tree between the two solstices slowly changes with the changing seasons: but it appears that the transfiguration of the cosmos will be one swift process: even as at the Parousia the analogous *change of fashion* in the bodies of the living saints will be quite instantaneous. See 1 Cor. xv. 52 and Phil. iii. 21 "Who shall *transfigure* or *re-fashion* the body of our humiliation unto (lasting) *conformity* with the body of His glory." Yet after all it is not

Digitized by Google

32 But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord:

33 But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please *his* wife.

34 There is difference *also* between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please *her* husband.

35 And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.

36 But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, if she pass the flower of *her* age, and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not: let them marry.

37 Nevertheless he that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well.

38 So then he that giveth *her* in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth *her* not in marriage doeth better.

39 The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

---

unlikely that in this text, *of this world* is the genit. of identity: in that case "this wicked world," as sullied with sin, is itself the passing fashion or perishing husk of a lasting form, is itself the turbid *phænomenon* of the serene *nooumenon* see Hebr. xi. 3, which "in the morning of the resurrection," like a dissolving dream, shall be superseded by the divine realities of a transfigured creation, "the new heavens and the new earth." This archetypal order of the universe is often described as even now imminent and ready to be unveiled and waiting only for "the last time."

**34.** Jerome's arrangement, reproduced by some recent commentators, that *καὶ μεμέρισται* with a full stop after it be annexed to verse 33, is open to serious objections: (1) that the verb means *parted* rather than *distracted* and if it meant *divided* even, would be a feeble appendage; (2) it destroys the *symmetry* of the clauses; (3) the verb is actually wanted in verse 34 just as *ἡ ἄγαμος* placed (by Jerome after the words *wife* and *virgin*) is not wanted there: compare in verse 25 *virgins* without an epithet. Render therefore, "**Parted also are** (or *is*) **the wife and virgin alike:**" i. e. these two classes of women, as well as the two of men, the husband and the bachelor, are parted: their aims of life are different: these separate aims or interests are further specified in the next sentence. "That she *may be* holy:" rather "that she *be* holy;" for the word *that* seems to make special the more general "the things of the Lord" and to define their direction: this is all but certain from the "how she *should* please" of the next clause.

**35.** For the thought see verse 28 "I wish to spare you the sufferings." How unobtrusive of his own Apostolic authority is St. Paul! Render:—"**This I say** (not as wishing to dictate, but) **to further your own true interest; not that I may cast a noose over you, but to further orderliness and close attendance on the Lord without distraction**"—from household troubles that shall wax more and more cumbersome in "the perilous time."

**36. Yet**—again a corrective to the foregoing recommendation of the single estate—**if some** (rather than *any*) father or guardian **thinks that he is behaving unhandsomely towards his virgin** *daughter or ward*, **in case she be past prime, and if such a step becomes a duty, let him do what he wills** or purposes to do: **he sinneth not:** for "marriage is honourable in all:" **let them** the maiden and her lover **marry.**

**37. Yet**—another corrective of the preceding corrective—"**he who in his heart standeth fast and is not under pressure** (from without) **but hath command over his own settled will** or purpose **and hath made this resolve in his own heart—to keep** (at home unmarried) **his own virgin, such a one will act well.**"

**39.** "Only in the Lord" i. e. *let her marry a Christian*

Digitized by Google

40 But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the Spirit of God.

---

**40. "Happier however is she, if she so abide to the end"** (aorist). *Happier*, because unmarried and so standing aloof from domestic trials that will become sharper as the Advent draws nearer, she will be in a better position for devout preparation to meet her Lord. "Happier—according to *my* judgment"—which you may not value much—"*yet*" (another corrective) "I think that *I* too, as well as Apollos and other teachers, have the Spirit of God." A truly modest way of saying, Under the guidance, if not of a special revelation, at least of general inspiration, I have been stating my own views.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 9, 21.

**9.** Alford is hardly right in rendering "but if they are incontinent"; for, when two states or cases are contrasted, οὐκ after εἰ is better than μή, as making vivid the contrast; besides the οὐ does not coalesce with the word following, except in phrases similar to ἐπ' οὐ θεῷ "a non-god' or οὐ λαός "a no-people." The *no* or *none* should be always kept in translation. Even in Alford's cited line of the Ajax 1131, οὐκ ἐᾷς cannot coalesce into "disallow:" rather, "if, *as the fact is*, you do not allow:" here too οὐκ is better than μή, as the εἰ, like ὅτε, ushers in not an hypothesis, but a recognised fact. The instance in this ver. 9 of οὐκ after εἰ stands on a different ground. It seems that in cases of contrasts and of facts οὐκ after εἰ is admissible. In Medea 87, οὐ does not coalesce with στέργει at all, as meaning *dislikes:* for the true idea is "If, *as is notorious*, the father loves not:" εἰ μη = *nisi*, εἰ οὐ = *si non*. In Thucyd. i. 121, curiously in one sentence we have these two uses of οὐ after εἰ (1) pointing to known fact, (2) to contrast.

**21.** This passage is a hotly contested field: the battle has raged and still rages around the εἰ καί, which after all is not the central position! Hermann's famous distinction was made between two phrases that cannot be compared. For in εἰ καί the καί has nothing to do with the εἰ, since καί always acts upon the word or words immediately following. So καὶ εἰ=*even if* or *and if* may be dismissed. In εἰ καὶ δύνασαι the εἰ means *if*, and καί affects δύνασαι . . . , but *how?* In what way? The context decides it to the reader, the intonation of the voice to the hearer. There are two ways of rendering: (1) "If you *are* (voice raised) able to become free" = "if you are even able," nearly = "*although* you are;" (2) "if you are also *able* to become free," if you are able *as well:* where the office of καί is to set *the power of becoming free* side by side with *the state of being a slave*. For this use comp. Soph. Antigone 89. εἰ καί δυνήσει γ', ἀλλ' ἀμηχάνων ἐρᾷς. Trachiniæ, 71. εἰ καὶ τοῦτ' ἔτλη="if he *did* dare this deed (actually). Cf. 1 Pet iii. 14. Which of these two ways is correct here, the *context* must determine. The ἀλλά does not determine it, as some think, because the negative μή in the preceding clause does not of necessity make ἀλλά adversative. 'Αλλά may = *still* or *nevertheless*, because the μή is feeble and not strong, and the preceding clause means simply "never you mind" or "be easy." Thus, as far as *this* context goes, the two scales still hang in equipoise, for ἀλλά may be either adversative = *but*, or corrective = *still* or *nevertheless*. What remains then in the rest of the context to strike the balance? Clearly the verb χρῆσαι, both as to its tense and as to its sense. For the aorist denotes not a continuance in the old state, but the assumption or adoption of something else, and the meaning of the verb is not *use* or *go on using* (that would require the imperfect χρῶ) but *make use of;* "make use of" *what?* This of course must be supplied, as usual, from the nearest foregoing clause (comp. Eur. ὅταν τις εἰδῇ τἀγαθὸν χρῆται δὲ μή), which is the εἰ clause, and the whole of this clause must be supplied, not τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, as some think, that cannot be, but properly αὐτῷ = τῷ δύνασθαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι. Bengel's "potius utere *facultate* libertatis assequendæ" only requires *utitor* for *utere* to make it complete, though Bengel is inclined to the other view. But to do, what so many do, to unearth τῇ δουλείᾳ out of the distant δοῦλος and then to drag it all the way to χρῆσαι and there affix it alien to an alien tense, is as awkward as it is far-fetched: and even when it *is* appended to χρῆσαι, it is inapposite to the tense and to the sense of the verb, which means "avail yourself of" it. Above all τῇ δουλείᾳ is not only too far off, but also too big a word to be *understood:* it must have been *expressed* in full, and, if it had been *expressed*, it should rather have been connected with χρῶ or ἀποχρῶ. After χρῆσαι therefore supply that, which alone can be supplied, αὐτῷ = τῷ δύνασθαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι.

Digitized by Google

On the above grounds it seems better to explain thus "In slavery wast thou called? Never mind:—still if thou art also *able* to become free, rather make use of it than not." The above rendering, which (in spite of the four grammatical and three logical objections advanced by some and stated at length in Alford's commentary) Greek usage appears simply to *demand*, receives logical support from the next verse, rightly understood.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

1 *To abstain from meats offered to idols.* 8, 9 *We must not abuse our Christian liberty, to the offence of our brethren:* 11 *but must bridle our knowledge with charity.*

NOW as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.

2 And if any man think that he

---

### CHAP. VIII.—INTRODUCTION.

Of meats offered to idols a man strong in the faith of one God may partake without scruple. His knowledge of the Truth has convinced him that nothing in the whole world is in strict propriety an idol, i.e. a symbol of some corresponding divinity which in fact has no existence anywhere. His conscience therefore cannot be defiled, if he partake of meats that have been offered to no-gods. But still in the *use and application* of this knowledge he will be guided by the rule of charity: he will subordinate his own superior discernment of truths in morals to a tender regard for the spiritual welfare of others. If, for example, being present at a feast he should see there a weaker brother, who still cherishes a lingering belief in Zeus or in Aphrodite and who will defile his own conscience if he partake of meats that have been offered on their altars, what will the man who leavens his knowledge with charity, do? He will then and there abstain from such meats lest, if he should partake of them himself, his weaker brother, following his example, should partake of them too and so commit sin; for whoso thinks an act, that is in itself indifferent, to be sin, to him it is sin.

1. "Concerning idol-meats we are aware"—in a tone of pleasant irony—"that we *all* possess knowledge: yes, we are aware that, as you remind me in your letter, we all possess knowledge." Here the vein of bantering acquiescence stops: now the style changes; it becomes sententious and stern, with a light touch of sarcasm. That there are such light touches in this chapter, as in many others, is manifest, e. g. in ver. 10 "shall be *edified* to eat." The difficulty is to account for the abrupt transition from *knowledge* to *knowledge*. Probably the solution is as follows: when the writer has dictated the clause "we all possess knowledge," the very word *knowledge*, used as it was or even flaunted by the vain Corinthians in their letter to him, awakens his old irrepressible scorn of Hellenic intellectual pride. Hence the startling abruptness, hence the otherwise strange omission just here of such logical links as *yet* or *however* (and the consequent efforts of commentators to establish a parenthesis somewhere): hence also the reappearance for the fifth time in this epistle of the significant and contemptuous term *puffeth up*. We may suppose therefore that starting at the echo of the ominous word "knowledge" the Apostle with mournful or indignant emphasis reiterates it in vehement asyndeton to his amanuensis. "We all possess knowledge" (complacently): "knowledge!" (incisively) what is it worth? How does it work? "Knowledge *puffeth up!* whereas *charity buildeth up*."

If the above view is correct, it accounts for the otherwise stubborn asyndeton: it also renders unnecessary the assumption of a "logical parenthesis" as it is called, advocated and assigned within different limits by different expositors. The article before γνῶσις and ἀγάπη seems to contrast *the intellectual habit of knowledge* and *the moral habit of charity*. On the word *charity* see note at end of this Epistle.

The sense of *v.* 2 is: mere knowledge, true and sound in its substance though it be, yet unless it be transfigured by the light of Christian love, inevitably tends, human nature being what it is, to puff up its possessor, to distend him with self-arrogance, to blow him into a conspicuous bubble full of moral emptiness and of intellectual vanity. Charity, on the other hand, or regard for the true welfare of others, is that industrious benevolence which, like a conscientious mason, in the building of God's house helps to set solid and to keep stedfast living stone upon living stone. For in the specific instance of idol-meats the rightheaded and righthearted man, abstaining from questionable food on proper occasions, actually *edifies* by setting an example that may snatch from perdition many a brother for whom Christ died.

As οἶδα and γινώσκω occur often in this Epistle, it may not be out of place here to distinguish between the two verbs. For this

Digitized by Google

knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know.

3 But if any man love God, the same is known of him.

4 As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol *is* nothing in the world, and that *there is* none other God but one.

5 For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,)

6 But to us *there is but* one God, the Father, of whom *are* all things, and we [1]in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *are* all things, and we by him.

[1] Or, *for him*, Rom. 11. 36.

---

distinction see an Additional Note at the end of the chapter.

**2.** *If anyone imagines that he knows this or that*, **if he fancies that he is a know-something, he never yet came to know anything as he ought**: *as*, to wit in the way of Christian charity. Vanity, not charity, moved him to acquire what he calls his knowledge. **But if anyone** I do not say imagines that he knows, I do not say really knows this or that, but if anyone **loves** and loves **God**, what then? In that case **He** (God) **is known by him**; and such a man possesses the highest and the true knowledge, that which alone can regulate and give a right determination to all other and inferior forms of knowledge whatsoever, whether discernment in *adiaphora* as for instance *idol-meats* or in anything else.

Probably the first clause of ver. 3 should be read with a slight pause after the word *loveth* thus: "But if anyone *loveth—God*. Compare ch. vi. 20 "ye were *bought*—with a *price*."

The above interpretation differs from the usual and apparently universal explanation of this text in making *he* (οὗτος) refer to *God*. For the ordinary view and for some reasons against it see Additional Note at the end of the chapter.

**4.** To revert to the eating of idol-meats—the term *eating* makes the general proposition of ver. 1 more definite—"we are aware that nothing in the world is an idol," strictly so called or what an idol is generally supposed to be, a symbol of a superhuman being: we are aware that nothing in the sphere of God's created cosmos is a visible representative of such or such a divine archetype, "and that no being is God except one (Being)."

The form of the Greek seems to favour the latter half at least of the above translation, especially as the phrase *there is no God* is in the LXX Deut. xxxii. 39, Psalm. xiv. 1, expressed by οὐκ ἐστὶ Θεός; whereas in our verse the Greek is οὐδεὶς Θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, which can hardly mean *there is not one God except one*. Compare also Mark and John οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ Θεός, "no one is good except God." The usual rendering of Chrysostom and of many others is, "an idol is a nothingness, a cipher, a vanity (μάταιον LXX often) in the world, and there is no god except one."

**5.** Reasons for the above statement. Render:—"**For even if indeed there are so-called gods whether in heaven or upon earth**, whether in the upper or the lower region of the aforesaid cosmos (see Gen. ii. 1), **just as there are gods plenty! and lords plenty! nevertheless to us one God the Father.**" Polytheism is a question quite irrelevant to our position as Christians. See Note at the end of the chapter.

**6.** The reasoning here runs upon several antitheses. Plainly contrasted with each other are (1) *one God* and *many gods* (2) *one Lord* and *many lords:* and as plainly related mutually to each other are (1) *one God* and *all things* (2) *one Lord* and *all things*. Thus there is a double contrast and a double correlation: and the writer clearly intends that the double correlation between the *one* and the *all* should make vivid and conspicuous the double contrast between the *one* and the *many*. So far then the reasoning will be, If to the heathen are many gods, nevertheless to us Christians one God, the originative cause of all things: again, if to the heathen are many lords, yet to us one Lord, the mediatorial cause of all things. The oneness excludes the manyness, and the allness is *as* the oneness. This last idea is truly Pauline: out of many texts one very similar to this is in 1 Tim. ii. 5 "*One* God, *one* mediator too between God and men, Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *all*." Here the universality of redemption is *as* the unity of God and the unity of the mediator. Precisely by the same mode of reasoning in the text *One God, of whom is the All*, the universality of creation is as the unity of the Creator, and in the text *One Lord, through whom is the All*, the universality of the lordship is as the unity of the Lord. But, it may be asked, *why* is the double correlation between the *oneness* and the *allness* imported here? As stated above, in order to make conspicuous the nothingness of the many gods and many lords as compared with the one God and one Lord. Thus; if there be one God, the primal creator of the

Digitized by Google

7 Howbeit *there is* not in every man that knowledge: for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat *it* as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled.

---

Universe, what then? This fact *undeifies* all the *gods many*, for so far from being "gods by nature" or having a share in creation, they must have been themselves created, as parts of the universe, and therefore not meet objects of worship. Again, if there be one Lord, the acting creator and ruling governor of the Universe, which He created, what then? This fact dethrones from a share in the supreme dominion all the *lords many*, and reduces them to subordinate and accountable powers.

It may be observed that τὰ πάντα here means the *universe* absolutely, "all the cosmical systems of actual creation." It often means the same as κόσμος or (as in Heb. i. 2) οἱ αἰῶνες *i. e.* "the infinite multitude of worlds which have their existence in unlimited periods or successions of time;" in other words, the concrete contents of the abstract time-reaches of unknown duration. The above clauses in inverted commas are from Delitzsch *in loco*, Heb. i., who also adds (pertinently to our text) "Creator of this universe of worlds is God: Mediator of that creation is the Son."

*We* **unto** *Him* (God), and *we* **through** *Him* (Christ). Besides the two contrasts between the *one* and the *many*, and besides the two correlations between the *one* and the *all*, we now come to another antithesis between two *creations*, the physical and the spiritual. This distinction stands out clear: "one God the creator of the cosmos, and *we unto Him;*" *i. e.* He is the centre unto which we, the καινὴ κτίσις, or *new creation* of the redeemed church, all converge.

Again, "Our Lord Jesus Christ and *we through Him:*" *i. e.* He is the way and the sole medium by which we reach the goal of God. In fact, the Father is here represented as the *willer* of natural creation and the *final cause* of the spiritual; the Son as the mediator, and agent in both. Compare Hebr. x. 7: "Lo! I come to *do* thy *will*, O God." Unquestionably to the Father, as Father, is here assigned a *priority* both in Deity and in the *fiat* or creative power that issues from Deity; but this is a priority of order, not a superiority in degree; for there can be no degrees either in the substance or in the power of godhead. He who is here called one God, is so called as being *Fons Deitatis* to the eternally begotten Son; and St. Paul's statement, "there is one God the Father," no more excludes Jesus Christ from being God, than his other statement, "there is one Lord Jesus Christ," excludes the Father from being Lord; and if it be blasphemy to exclude the Father from being Lord, it is no less blasphemy to exclude Jesus Christ from being God. Hence there is nothing at all in this passage that is at variance with the Athanasian Creed, "The Father is God, the Son God; the Father is Lord, the Son Lord; and yet One Lord and one God." The distinction of divine operations in the material and in the spiritual creation is as the distinction of the divine *Personalities*.

7. The Apostle in ver. 1 has said in an easy tone of general acquiescence half-ironical, "We are aware that (as you remind me in your letter) we all possess knowledge." He now states seriously and more incisively his own opinion as to the actual *universality* of this *knowledge* or enlightenment in moral truths. "Nevertheless not in *all*, but in *some* only is knowledge;" to wit, there is among you a class of converts, men half-enlightened, who cannot altogether shake off a lingering suspicion that the so-called gods, whom they so lately worshipped, may after all not be nonentities, but existences, and that idol-meats therefore ought not to be eaten by a Christian monotheist. "Not in *all* is such unhesitating discernment, but *some* with *their scruple of conscience about the idol* to this hour do eat (an idol-meat) *as* offered to an idol:" *i. e.* believing, or at any rate suspecting, that the image, to which the victim was offered, represents some superhuman being.

Hardly correct is the rendering of many "with a consciousness of the idol;" rather "*with the scruple of conscience* which they feel *about the idol*," with a touch or twinge of conscience concerning the image, whether after all there may not be a corresponding god behind it. *About the idol*, objective genitive of simple *relation*. Besides, εἰδέναι εἴδωλον = "to know *about* an idol;" see note on οἶδα, ver. 2. This scruple or misgiving is an expression or effect of the conscience itself, and is called by the name of its originating faculty; a use of words common enough, in which an effect is called by the name of a cause; just as we say "to make a conscience of it," or even to "make a face:" compare στόμα = (1) a mouth (2) mouth's utterance or speech. In the next clause *their conscience* denotes the faculty itself. A few remarks upon the meaning of this important word, several times occurring in these Epp., may be in place just here.

*Conscience* is a man's inward knowledge of his relation to God. It is an inborn faculty,

Digitized by Google

8 But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, [1]are we the better; neither, if we eat not, [1]are we the worse.

9 But take heed lest by any means this [1]liberty of your's become a stumblingblock to them that are weak.

[1] Or, *have we the more.*
[1] Or, *have we the less.*
[1] Or, *power.*

10 For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be [1]emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols;

11 And through thy knowledge

[1] Gr. *edified.*

---

Chrysostom calls it a *natural* or *constitutional* faculty, of *knowing with* one's own self, *with* the responsible self: knowing what or about what? A certain divine law written in the heart. Conscience at first prompts a man to act in accordance with this inward law of distinction between right and wrong, which is inwoven in his created constitution. After a while it discharges another office; it *sits in judgment* upon the man's moral conduct, and then thoughts or reasonings arise within him and engage in controversy with one another (μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων Rom. ii.), just like counsel for the prosecution and counsel for the defence, accusing or excusing, condemning or justifying, the moral conduct. If the man act upon the early impulses in direction of what is lawful and right and these acts grow into a habit, this innate faculty is called, that which it is, a *good* conscience (Acts xxiii. 1) or *pure* (1 Tim. iii. 9) or *void of offence* (Acts xxiv. 16). If a man resist or repress the first promptings and do what he suspects or believes to be wrong, his conscience is in precisely corresponding degree spotted, sullied, *defiled* (as here, ver. 9). In that case nothing but the application of the blood of Christ can cleanse it from such defilement (Hebr. ix. 14). But if he disregard this holy sprinkling and turn not to God through Christ, his conscience becomes *distorted*, so that its sentences cannot be trusted or, worse still, it becomes *evil* πονηρά (Heb. ix.) "putting light for darkness and darkness for light," and finally *seared* (1 Tim. iv. 2). Now indeed the heart is hardened, and then in some men no more *in this world* do thoughts arise to accuse or condemn, while in others the conscience, from being the judge, becomes the torturer, wielding lashes of remorse. This fearful *Nemesis* the ancients knew well: see Æschylus and Juvenal, *passim*. *Conscience* therefore denotes a *knowing with one's own self* of an inward divine law.

Another reading for *conscience* is συνηθείᾳ = *familiarity* or *long association with* the idol. *To this hour i. e.* even *after* conversion to Christianity: so Chrysostom.

8. "Meat will not set us in the presence of God." How can it? Moral conduct good and evil thoughts, words, deeds, will be the means of presenting us to God at the Parousia. Meats are things *indifferent*.

Neither if we eat not, do we find ourselves **inferior** (middle voice), nor if we eat are we **superior**. *If we eat not* . . . this probably to encourage the weaker brethren, lest from a feeling of false shame or from a fear of being thought narrowminded or of incurring some loss, they might be led to act against their own conscience by the example of men endowed with more knowledge than charity. *Nor if we eat, gain we an advantage:* this probably to check the loud confidence of the self-styled Paulines, men who had formed right conceptions indeed of Pauline principles, but erred in the application; men who boasted of a large intelligence, yet abused their Christian privileges; their motto was *all things are lawful*, their watchwords *knowledge* and *freedom*. See Neander, History of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 244. Members of this party, very likely, expected from the Apostle in his letter of reply an opinion favourable to the unrestricted use of all meats in all circumstances, under the impression that by their own indiscriminate eating they were doing God service and themselves a benefit in thus exhibiting both their contempt of idols and an undivided allegiance to the one Lord. St. Paul's reply is a rebuke to their conceit: "esculents are things irrelevant to God's judgment; at His bar they will not weigh a grain of sand in either scale against us or in our favour; *if we eat*, **we gain no superiority**." The better reading of one first-rate MS. is περισσευόμεθα.

9. Sense is, Let your motto be *forbearance* not *privilege*, and your watchword *charity* not *knowledge*. Never flaunt your knowledge, seldom use your privilege. Seest thou yon brother reclining at the same feast with thee? In his presence abstain from questionable food; for to him, a dullard in moral truths, thou art a knowsomething, a luminary in the church; beware lest he, like a moth dazed by a candle, circle round thy perilous example and perish in its light.

10. "**For if any** (dullard) **should see thee, who hast knowledge, in an idol temple reclining at table, will not his conscience, he being weak, be edified unto the eating of idol-meats? and so like to perish is the weakling by thy**

Digitized by Google

shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?

12 But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ.

13 Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.

---

**knowledge, he a brother—for whom Christ died!"**

*By* = within the circle and attraction of thy knowledge. *Be edified*, with a touch of irony; be *finely built up indeed!* "Emboldened" A. V. will hardly do: "fortified" would perhaps be better; but even that is not correct, as clearly a pointed allusion half-sarcastic is made to ver. 2 *charity edifieth.*

*Idol-temple;* in which feastings often followed the sacrifice: see Horace, "Voveram *dulces epulas* et album Libero caprum." Odes iii. 8.

**12. "In fact, when in this way ye sin against the brethren and smite their conscience, it is against Christ ye sin."** For the loving and lasting sympathy of the Divine Head with all His members, even with the meanest and least of His brethren, see Matt. xxv.

**13. "For this very reason if a matter of food** (in general) **layeth a trap for my brother, no fear that I eat flesh** (in particular) **any more for ever."** That is, to make sure of not eating *sacrificial* flesh to the spiritual detriment of a brother, I will never again eat flesh *of any sort*. *For ever* = "unto the Age or Aeon of Messiah's reign."

N.B. *Scandalum* in Greek = properly a "trap-spring" or "baited stick in a trap": cf. Aristoph. Acharn. σκανδαλήθρ' ἱστὰς ἐπῶν = setting word-traps.

It is curious that in this chapter St. Paul makes no reference to the Apostolic decree of Jerusalem, Acts xv. 29. See good reasons for this omission stated in Introd. tothe Acts, p. 325, col. 2.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 1, 2, 5.

1. Οἶδα = I know *about* one, I know by seeing or by hearsay, by observation from externals: hence often it means, I am aware of this or that *fact*, οἶδ' ὅτι. For instance, I am sure that there is such a place as Stamboul, I am aware of it by hearsay: but not having been there, I have no personal knowledge of the city: οἶδα μὲν τὴν πόλιν, ἔγνωκα δ' οὔ. Γινώσκω, while it includes οἶδα, contains also much more: piercing through circumstantial knowledge it reaches to discernment of the inner nature, of character, of moral qualities, habits, temper, affections. It signifies appreciative or experimental acquaintance, whether good or bad, such as exists between intimate friends or inveterate foes. Instances are Matt. vii. 23 "I never *knew* you," ἔγνων: I never recognised in you any likeness or affinity to myself. Contrast this with the demon's exclamation in Luke iv. 34 "I know thee *who* thou art, the Holy One of God;" οἶδά σε τίς εἶ. Again Luke xxiv. 35 "He was made known to them in the breaking of bread," and John x. 14 "I know my sheep, and am known of mine;" the recognition of affinity and of mutual affection. One more instance denoting interior familiarity is St. Paul's famous description of our Lord as τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν, *i. e.* one "who never by His own personal experience came to know sin in its evil nature," one "who himself ever environed by the subtle moral atmosphere of sin, never admitted a breath of it (so to speak) into His moral lungs." Hence in this second verse γνῶσις means "discernment of truths in morals:" just as ἐπιστήμη strictly means a knowledge of truths in science, of such truths as are ascertained by demonstrative reasonings from axiomatic principles.

2. In the new explanation οὗτος is made to refer to τὸν Θεόν. If however, as all commentators seem to think, the structure of the Greek demands that the οὗτος be referred to εἴ τις, then in accordance with their explanation we must, in order to make the argument complete, supply a missing link by appending a clause thus: "If anyone loveth God, *he* is known of Him (God)," and therefore knows *Him* by whom he is known; in other words the Apostle *states* the logically less important truth, leaving its correlative truth to be *inferred*. This latter view, being apparently universal, may be correct: yet against it must be urged that the emphatic οὗτος, as pointing to εἴ τις, a construction common enough, is nevertheless simply not needed here, and that instead of the enclitic αὐτοῦ we should certainly have expected the emphatic τούτου, and perhaps a different order of the words. Bengel goes so far as to translate ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ *ab ipso!* It is also better, if possible, not to resort to the expedient of a missing link, and that especially when it is a significant one.

Digitized by Google

As regards οὗτος being referred to *God* compare Acts x. 36 where it is referred to *Jesus Christ.*

**5.** If the above view be correct, place a comma after ὥσπερ εἰσίν; and then *gods plenty* and *lords plenty* is an after-thought added with a touch of sarcasm, and each εἰσί will denote a subjective existence in the heathen mind. Another view held by many, for the Greek is ambiguous, is to make each εἰσὶ point to an objective existence, the sense being, "For even if indeed there exist (I do not say that they do exist, I leave that an open question) so-called gods, such as in heaven Zeus, Pallas, Apollo, or upon earth deified men or deified powers of nature, even if such gods exist just as in the sense that there exist gods many and lords many (*angels* and possibly *demons*), still to us Christians one God the Father."

The reasoning of εἴπερ εἰσίν and ὥσπερ εἰσίν is one of analogy, namely, if on the ground that *gods many* and *lords many* do actually exist it be granted that the *so-called gods* of the heathen also actually exist, nevertheless the great truth for all believers remains unshaken that there is one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ. St. Paul's alleged existence of many gods and many lords is founded upon Deut. x. 17 "The Lord your God, he is God of the gods and Lord of the lords." See also Psalm. cxxxvi. *vv.* 2 and 3. Of these two interpretations the first is on several grounds preferable, more especially as the double πολλοί has a ring of impatient sarcasm in it, twice accentuating the Apostle's contempt of polytheism. The same vehemence of irony will account for the absence of λεγόμενοι before the second θεοί, if indeed its presence is desirable.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

1 *He sheweth his liberty,* 7 *and that the minister ought to live by the gospel:* 15 *yet that himself hath of his own accord abstained,* 18 *to be either chargeable unto them,* 22 *or offensive unto any, in matters indifferent.* 24 *Our life is like unto a race.*

AM I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye my work in the Lord?

2 If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you:

---

CHAP. IX. St. Paul proves at some length his Apostolic claim to ecclesiastic maintenance (1–15) but immediately asserts that he never did and never will exercise this right. Why not? Because (vers. 15–23) he finds an ample recompense for *gratuitous* gospel-work in an enlarged access to all sorts and conditions of men, and in a correspondingly enlarged hope of attaining to the great Messianic salvation at the Parousia.

N.B. Some serious difficulties in this chapter will be better met, if attention be first drawn to certain words and phrases. In vers. 9, 10, 19 γάρ is used *elliptically* in the sense of *why surely*, and in each instance after an interrogative sentence. Again Greek words containing *evangel* occur nine times, making prominent the great mission and business of St. Paul—to set forth the gospel continually. Conspicuous in the argument is the oft-recurring term ἐξουσία, which must be briefly discussed. This word is stated in Plat. Defin. 415 c. to mean ἐπιτροπὴ νόμου, a *grant* or *permission of law*. Compare with this definition Acts xxvi. 12, where the two words come together, "with *authority* and *commission* from the chief priests." This view tallies with the word's etymon ἐξ: for ἔξεστι = "it is permitted *from without*," "it is *lawful*," just as ἔνεστί μοι = "it is *in* my power," "*within* my reach." One instance of this use Matt. xxviii. 18 "There was given me all power in heaven and earth," i. e. *a grant of full power ab extra* from the Father. This word occurs in N. T. in frequent connection with δίδωμι, denoting a conferred license or authority or free permission. Hence it often signifies "*a right of power* over this or that bestowed *from without*," whether by God or by law or by consent of the community: perhaps *privilege* may meet its requirements. *Liberty of action*, a rendering now in vogue, fails to hit the true idea, as οὐσία or *being* is not *to without* but *from without*. In this chapter *privilege* or *prerogative* or *licence* seems to suit all the places.

**1. Am I not free?**] In civil or social sense. **Am I not an apostle?** In the time of our Lord *apostoli* were accredited envoys or delegates, armed with full powers to execute commissions abroad, and *despatched from their own seat of government into foreign countries*. Hence our Lord *applying* the ready-made title to the chosen twelve, says, "As thou didst *send* me *into the world*, even so I *send* them *into the world*." It seems then that an apostle may be regarded as "an ambassador of peace *despatched into the world by Christ the King*, with full authority to preach the Gospel and to found churches." How truly foreign, how hostile, both the divine Apostle

Digitized by Google

for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord.

3 Mine answer to them that do examine me is this,

4 Have we not power to eat and to drink?

5 Have we not power to lead about a sister, a [1]wife, as well as other apostles, and *as* the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?

6 Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?

7 Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a

[1] Or, *woman*.

---

of the Father and the human apostles of Christ found the cosmos, see ch. iv. 9–14.

*have I not seen Jesus?*] Full sense, 'How can any of you Corinthians call in question my claim to the apostolate, when mine eyes have seen the *risen* Jesus? Are the other apostles eyewitnesses to the fact of the resurrection? So am I.' Here St. Paul might have added 'I indeed more than they: for they beheld Him after His resurrection and before His glorification: I saw Him after both: *my* claims are at least equal to *theirs*.'

St. Paul is here asserting his own official claims against his Judaizing assailants, and it should be noted that in this vindication the visible and audible manifestation (Acts xxii. 6–11) is a much more important element than the ecstatic revelations (Acts xx. 17 and xviii. 9), because "a mere ecstatic vision," writes Neander, "could not have legitimated St. Paul's apostleship." In fact he would have been his own witness in that case, whereas there were other witnesses to his interview with the Lord near Damascus, who themselves beheld the light of the glory.

2. **If to others**—emissaries from Palestine or Judaizers **I am not an Apostle**—Paul is no Apostle of ours! say they—**still to you at least I am.**

N.B. The γε does not strengthen ἀλλά, as so many say, for ἀλλά is not an intensifiable word: the particle throws forward a strong light upon ὑμῖν. Compare κατά γε τοῦτο.

Further proof of the assertion "I am an Apostle." **For my seal of the Apostleship you are.** Emphasis on *you*. *In the Lord*, the *in* is not easy to explain. Comparing other parallels, it seems to denote *an inner circle*, with Christ for its radiating centre, *of spiritual light* environed all round by an unlimited dark margin of profane cosmos. Here the Corinthian church itself is represented as the genuine seal of a genuine Apostolate, a seal legible in the light of the Lord. In other words, not the miracles wrought by St. Paul (as Chrysostom), but his living converts to the faith are the monument to which he points: *the fact of the church is the seal of his call.*

3. "*My* reply to those who examine *me* is *this*," the existence of a Christian community. If *me* and my title the Judaizers are sifting by preliminary scrutiny in hopes of finding a true bill against me, *my* reply is, *The fact of the Church is the warrant of my title.* The terms *reply* and *examine* are forensic; see on *anacrisis* ch. iv. 3, 4, 5.

4, 5. Having verified his own divine call to the Apostolate, St. Paul now substantiates his claims to certain rights or privileges of the Apostolate. The chief of these privileges was an Apostle's right of maintenance at the charges of the Church, both for himself and, if needs be, for a wife travelling with him. "*Have* we not privilege to eat and to drink?" (at the cost of the Church is implied in the word privilege). We have. "Have we not privilege to take about with us a Christian woman for wife?" Don't say (μή) we have not: for we have. The word *wife* means here just what it means elsewhere. How *Suicer* and others make it = *serviens matrona* is not easy to see. *As also the rest of the Apostles* implies that, if not all, yet most of the Apostles were married men: St. Paul was not married.

6. **Or is it only I and Barnabas that have not privilege to abstain from working** for our daily bread?] In full: "*or*, if there is allowed to other Apostles and to Cephas a maintenance for themselves and wives, do you make an exception against myself and Barnabas and deny to *us* the privilege, which is accorded to Peter, of exemption from manual labour?" We may fairly infer from the word *only* that Barnabas and Paul both took the same view of self-maintenance and acted upon that high principle, whereas the rest of the Apostolic teachers claimed means of support from the Church: so Meyer. St. Paul plied the trade of tentmaking: how Barnabas wrought is not recorded. *Barnabas*, colleague of Paul in first missionary journey, and himself an Apostle. Both he and Saul were together *consecrated* and *ordained* Apostles at Antioch with fasting and praying and laying on of hands A.D. 46.

7. Proof of this Apostolic right or licence of exemption from self-maintenance drawn from three analogies in common life. Consider the case of the *soldier*, of the *vinedresser*, of the *shepherd*.

"**Who serveth in the army at his own charges ever? Who planteth a vineyard . . . who tendeth a flock?**"

Digitized by Google

vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?

8 Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also?

9 For it is written in the law of Moses, [a]Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen?

[a] Deut. 25. 4.

10 Or saith he *it* altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, *this* is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.

11 [b]If we have sown unto you spiritual things, *is it* a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?

[b] Rom. 15. 27.

12 If others be partakers of *this* power over you, *are* not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ.

---

**8, 9, 10.** Further proof, and that from Scripture, of this acknowledged principle of a proper privilege. Render, **Is it by man's rule**—from the low level of human judgment—**that I so speak, or doth the law too not say so? Why surely** (γάρ) **in the law of Moses it is written, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox while he treadeth out the corn. Is it of oxen that God is thinking** (in this statute), **or is it for our sakes entirely that he saith it? Why of course** (γάρ) **with an eye to us** (the clause) **was written, to show that he who ploweth ought to plow in hope and he who thresheth to thresh in hope of having a share** (in the fruit of labour).

In ver. 9 "Is it of oxen that God is thinking here?" This clause does not of course question God's providential care for animals, but only asserts that the passage cited has a higher sense.

Against certain rationalistic interpretations of these verses it may be remarked that in ver. 10 *that* (ὅτι)=not *because* in argumentative sense, as some, but in demonstrative sense = *to show that;* or in explicative sense = **in respect that,** the clause itself containing a specific interpretation of the general statement *for our sakes.* The argument of the whole passage is simple enough: the statute "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox . . . " was written for the benefit of us Christian teachers to show that we spiritual husbandmen in the field of God (ch. iii. 9) ought to plough in hope, and we spiritual *threshers* (corresponding to the corn-trampling *oxen*) ought to work in hope of having a share in the products of our spiritual labour. To this effect both Chrysostom and Theophylact: and that this is the right view appears on the very face of the diction, which is strictly *metaphorical.* Nevertheless, strange to say, the majority of interpreters make *us* = "mankind in general," and *the plougher* and *the thresher* to mean "labourers in agriculture." This view cannot be right (1) because *us* in this Epistle always points to Apostles or teachers or Christians; (2) because—what then becomes of a *metaphor's propriety?* The very use and aim of a metaphor is to elucidate certain points of resemblance in two things essentially different, often in things physical and things ethical: it reasons from the seen to the unseen, from the lower level to the higher. It is manifest that in this quotation from the O. T. St. Paul intends that the mind of the reader should glance quickly from the low plane of oxen trampling corn to the high plane—not of men threshing corn but—of spiritual cultivators tilling God's field. For the strict point of the analogy is this; as physical labour, so moral labour, has a right to hope for a share in the fruit of labour. A corn-treading ox and a plough-driving man are not on two levels, but on one level, and that material. See Cic. de Oratore, lib. iii. on *translatio* or metaphor.

**11.** Special application of the general argument. The double contrast and juxtaposition of *we* and *you* should be noted. Render "**If we to you did sow spiritual** (blessings), **a mighty thing is it if we of you should reap material** (goods)?" More correctly "your material goods:" such goods as meat, drink, clothing. *Did sow,* when we planted the church in Corinth.

"If we *should* reap." N.B. On logical grounds the subjunctive here is preferable to the future indicative, because εἰ with the subjunctive lays stress on the alternative of reaping: compare Sophocles: εἴ σου στερηθῶ = "if I *should* be bereaved of thee." Whereas εἰ with future tense not merely lays stress on the alternative of reaping, but makes that alternative likely or certain to eventuate: an idea hardly applicable here, as the Apostle we know emphatically refuses to exercise his *privilege.*

**12.** Render:—**If others in the privilege or allowance that concerns you** (**or comes from you**) **have a share, have not we more?** i. e. much rather. Em-

Digitized by Google

[c] Deut. 18. 1.
[1] Or, *feed*.

13 [c]Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things [1]live *of the things* of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?

14 Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.

15 But I have used none of these things: neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me: for *it were* better for me to die,

---

phatic are *others* and *you* and *we*. Full sense is, If other lesser teachers in Corinth have a share in this evangelistic licence or privilege which belongs to you (τῆς ὑμῶν—emphatic—ἐξουσίας) to substantiate, have not I the Apostolic founder of the churches a stronger claim to a share in that privilege, which *they* accept and enjoy?

All the commentators make ὑμῶν the objective genitive: rather it is subjective, especially if St. Paul intended the abstract *license* to harden into the concrete *maintenance*, and to be identified with it. How the ordinary rendering of *power over you* suits this passage, is not easy to see.

**12** continued. *But*—now at length *fulminat Paulus*, now descends the brief thunder long pent up. So far, proof after proof has been cited to shew in general that "the labourer is worthy of his hire," and this chain of proofs has been riveted by a special application to spiritual workers, and this rivet again has been clinched by the stated fact that other teachers in Corinth posterior to the Apostle have accepted that maintenance from the Church, to which the Apostle himself had a prior and a stronger claim. "Yes," he argues, "indisputable is my right of privilege, as I have amply proved." **But**—with triumphant emphasis, if not with a touch of sarcasm too—the fact is **we never made use of this privilege!** We never availed ourselves of it! (οὐκ with aorist sometimes = *never*); **but**-the very reverse—**we hold out, we are proof against all** pressure of temptation to appropriate our license of alien maintenance, **in order that we may furnish no obstacle to the gospel of Christ**: such an obstacle as the imputation of mercenary motives by some of the contributors, and consequent lukewarmness to the preaching.

N.B. Here στέγομεν = not so much *we endure* as we *resist* or *keep out*. This verb means either to *keep in*, as a cup holds wine, or to *keep out*, as a waterproof (ἱμάτιον στεγανόν) keeps out rain. The essential sense is that of *tightness*; whether against pressure of the *inward* or of the *outward*, circumstances determine. *Obstacle:* the figure seems to be, "in order that we may fell no tree across the path of the gospel;" similar in figure but different in sense is προκοπή.

**13.** Again he returns to the task of corroborating his Apostolic privilege. A loftier illustration than that of the soldier and the vinedresser and the shepherd and the corn-treading ox and the plough-driving man he now employs to enforce again and again his just claims. Why so? In order that he may thereby secure a fresh stepping-stone for reiterating his own absolute rejection of all ecclesiastic maintenance. **Know ye not that they who perform the sacred** *rites* (viz. Jewish priests) **from the sacred** *place* **get their food, and they who are in constant attendance on the altar do with the altar have their share** (of meat)? The altar consumes and the priest consumes, each in his own way, his own portion of the victim.

**15. I however** — with this precedent before me of Christ's own ordinance that he who proclaims the gospel should of the gospel live—I for one **have not made use of any one of these** prerogatives: **yet** (correctively—I wish you to understand) **I am not writing thus, that it may come to this in my case.** "Come to this," to wit, that I should use my license and accept food and clothing. Full sense: it *has* come to this, I know, in the case of other teachers: even Apostles have availed themselves of their just privilege: but *my* case is exceptional: I have reasons of my own: **for a happy thing for me** (see Mark ix. 42, 43) **rather to die than that any one should make my boast an empty one.** What boast? The substance of the assertion twice uttered in accents of triumph, "I never exercised any of my rights of privilege!" I never ate nor drank nor clothed myself at other's expense. The other reading οὐδεὶς for ἵνα τις being more difficult is the more probable: curiously enough, it happens *to yield precisely the same sense*.

N.B. No break or aposiopesis need be applied after ἤ, as some, and certainly no stop should be put after μου, as others. The construction in full is this: after ἤ supply ἵνα: common enough in Greek is the omission of a relative after ἤ, just as in English the omission of *that* after *than*, to wit, *rather than you should be put to trouble*, it were advisable . . . = rather than *that* you should . . . After μᾶλλον ἤ the negative in οὐδεὶς logically

Digitized by Google

than that any man should make my glorying void.

16 For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!

17 For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will, a dispensation *of the gospel* is committed unto me.

18 What is my reward then? *Verily* that, when I preach the gospel,

---

vanishes, and οὐδείς is equivalent to τις. In fact this is an instance of the well-known idiom μᾶλλον ἤ οὔ: the rationale of which is not far to seek: e. g. Herod iv. 118 "The Persian is come not a whit more against *us* than against *you*:" in the Greek, "than not against you;" the underlying thought being "he is *not* come against you." The explanation of this sudden apparition of the negative just where it is logically not wanted seems to be this. When in comparing two alternatives A and B, I pronounce aloud in favour of A, I mentally pass a negative judgment against B: and if I speak with some *emotion*, this mental negation springs up irrepressible and makes itself heard in the second clause, and that because I am eager to deny the contents of the second clause *considered apart from the first clause*. In fact, feeling masters logic and suddenly blurts out a negative, or what is the same thing, changes the logical τις into a sentimental οὐδείς. Something akin to this view writes Buttmann in Demosthen. contra Midiam, p. 143, who also observes that it is immaterial to the sense whether we say in Greek, *This I shall do rather than that*, or *this rather than not that*. If any scholar, however, should with Hermann demand a negation in the first clause, expressed or implied, he will find it already implied in ἀποθανεῖν = μὴ ζῆν, for death is in itself a negation of life: but the prior negative, writes Buttmann, is not necessary, nor indeed is it: see Thucyd. iii. 36. Instances in English of this otiose negative will occur to the reader.

**16.** Of the next two verses the meaning is much disputed: probably the sense is, "For if I should still set forth the gospel"—whether by preaching or by teaching, or even by writing—not possible for me is boasting. I glory in this only that, while I do the work of an evangelist, I support myself by my own labour; as to my evangelistic work itself, no possibility of glorying in *that!* for a *necessity* lieth upon me: my singular call from Christ, when he appeared to me near Damascus, marks me singular: an extraordinary commission creates an extraordinary responsibility: preach I must and teach I must, and that the gospel; **for woe is me, if I do not set forth the gospel to the end!** (aor. subj.)

**17, 18.** As to these difficult verses admitting of several explanations, it may be remarked that the following interpretation seems in its moral tone to be in keeping with that humble and ambiguous view of his future position in the kingdom which St. Paul sometimes evinces in his earlier Epistles, see Phil. iii. 12. It should be noted that in ver. 17—ἑκών = *of my own choice* or *self-determination* and πράσσω = *I make a business*, suggesting the next word μισθόν, or *recompense of labour*—and that in ver. 18 a comma should be put after *reward then*, and the mark of interrogation removed to the end of the verse. **For if by choice I make a business of this** — like other teachers — what then? **I have a recompense**—like them. God rewards volunteers in His own cause: **if, however, not of choice**—if not on the wing of *I will* but on the spur of *I must*, if in the shade of that overhanging necessity, I am doing this evangel work—what then? **A stewardship I hold in trust**; an administrator am I in the household of God, and as such strictly accountable. You may now fairly ask, if I have no sure and certain hope of recompense in the future as other Apostles have, who cheerfully obeyed an ordinary call from their Master, and if I do not choose to accept such maintenance in the present as they do—**what then is that recompense of mine, that I in setting forth the gospel should render free of charge the gospel of Christ in respect of my not making a downright use of my privilege in the gospel?** In other words, you infer, O Corinthians, that, if I persist in refusing my license of maintenance for evangel-work, I have some peculiar recompense inducing me to act thus: you are right: I have; and you ask what is it? Why (γάρ of ver. 19) it is this: my recompense is the opportunity of all-sidedness, which my very refusal of claimable privileges affords me; and beyond that and flowing therefrom, it is free access to men of all classes and races and opinions; and beyond that and flowing therefrom it is, when I have this free access to all manner of souls, the probability of my gaining and saving more than I should do if I were to make downright use of my privilege and thereby shock the feelings of some and so narrow my access to all. Again beyond this and towering above it in the distance, it is the possibility of myself sharing with a greater number of souls gained and

Digitized by Google

I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel.

19 For though I be free from all *men*, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more.

20 And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law;

21 To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.

---

saved the blessings of the gospel in the great day.

The above explanation of ver. 17 seems more than any other to preserve the logical continuity: space forbids to state other views.

N.B. In vv. 15, 16 καύχημα = *gloriatio*, not *materies gloriandi;* see ch. v. 6, and a note there. In ver. 18 render "that *I should*," or more exactly "that I *shall*" (θήσω): it is the ἵνα of contemplated result, for the recompense is a contemplated cause (i.e. a full Messianic salvation) of a contemplated *effect* i.e. *refusal of the privilege*. Equally common in English is this subjectively ecbatic use of *that:* exactly parallel (for a negative is cousin to an interrogative) is 1 Thess. v. 4, "You are not in darkness *that* the day *should* overtake you as thieves."

In sum, this recompense, stated in full from ver. 19 to ver. 23, is a rising tier upon tier of *spiritual gains* to St. Paul (κερδήσω occurs four times) culminating in a possible reward at the Parousia. It is a continual *excelsior*, like the successive achievements of an Alpine climber, winning eminence after eminence, and, to carry out the image, to St. Paul pressing forward and gaining one set of souls after another, the distant summit of his long labour is the dim hope of a joint attainment with his many saved (the more saved the better hope) to the Gospel promises at the first "resurrection *from* the dead." For this doctrinal view of his and for this modest estimate of himself compare what he says elsewhere, Phil. iii. 11, and this chapter *ad fin.*

**19.** First instalment of the recompense. *Free* here = independent as to means of subsistence. **For being free from all, unto all I made myself a slave** (when I resolved to preach gratuitously) **in order that I might gain the more.** Antithesis between *all* and *more.* Oxymoron also in *free* and *slave:* the all-sided freedom gave full scope to an all-sided service in the cause of the gospel. This word *slave* should not be pressed beyond the oxymoron. But what does *the more* mean? This is important. Not "the greatest number," as Alford and others; the comparative is strictly comparative: rather *a greater number thereby;* for the article here points backward to *all*, the correlative of *more*, and denotes the contemplated more souls convertible under gratuitous preaching attracting *all*, than under paid preaching attracting some but repelling others. Just as in examinations, the higher the fixed maximum of marks, the higher is the numerical total that may be achieved: an examinee, examiners being equal, is more likely to obtain 4000 out of 12,000 than out of 6000. Or if the four quadrants of a circle may represent all the classes of men accessible to the all-facing Apostle, he may reckon on gaining more converts in number out of all the four than out of one or two quadrants only. The rendering of the A.V. is right, for it is *the more* of comparison between a lesser number gained out of *some* classes and a greater number gained out of *all.*

**20. And I behaved to the Jews as a Jew, that Jews I might gain.**

E.g. Paul, in compliance with Jewish customs, ὡς Ἰουδαῖος, circumcised Timothy at Lystra; Acts xvi. 3.

*To them that are under the law*, not Judaic Christians (as Grotius) but Jews (as Theophylact), regarded from their religious position, into which St. Paul condescended to enter in matters indifferent such as observance of vows or ceremonial cleansings: see Acts xxi. 26. **Whereas I was not myself under Law:** see Gal. ii. 19, and a clear and useful note by Bp. Lightfoot on νόμος. See likewise 'Introd. to Romans,' p. 41–48 in this volume. *Not being*, as I *knew* that I was not: μή denotes *consciousness.*

**21.** Another instance of *condescension*, and that to the outside Heathen, see Acts xvii.; St. Paul at Athens discoursed to Greeks in Greek fashion, quoting from Greek poets. **To God's outlaws I behaved as an outlaw, not being,** as I well knew, **an outlaw of God, but an inlaw of Christ.** If here the word *outlaw*, or "one *put* out of the law's protection," be thought too positive a term for Heathen, who simply lay outside the pale of the Mosaic Law, in its place may be suggested *lacklaw*, formed like *lackland*, *lackbrain*, *lackwit*, *lacklustre*. *Lacklaw* and *lawless* are terms both true to the Greek, rather more so than *outlaw:* but *lawless* is now too much identified with *insubordinate* or *impious.*



Digitized by Google

22 To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all *men*, that I might by all means save some.

23 And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with *you*.

24 Know ye not that they which

---

*Inlaw* (compare an *inland* town) is used by Somner and by Bacon as a verb = "to restore to the law's protection." Full sense—"whereas I was not without law in relation to God, but under law in relation to Christ," to wit (as Chrysostom) "under the law of the Spirit and of Grace." Bengel here observes, with equal truth and pith, "He who is an outlaw to God, is likewise an outlaw to Christ; and he who is an inlaw to Christ, is also an inlaw to God." What is the law of Christ? See Gal. vi. 2, *lex Christi lex est caritatis*.

22. **I behaved to weaklings** (in the faith or in discernment of moral truths) **as a weakling.** A notable instance of this accommodation we had in ch. 8, abstention from questionable meats. **To them all I have become all things** (all-sided to all classes) **that by all methods I may save some.** He now for *gain* substitutes *save*, or bring to salvation. Why so? Because the Apostle's mind has run over the long course of winning all souls, and is approaching the final goal of the Messianic salvation, the culmination of the recompense.

23. Here the particle of correction or of transition *yet* or *now* brings to view the keystone suspended over the uncompleted arch; it reveals the possible crown of gratuitous labour dimly discerned through a long perspective of spiritual winnings, the last bright link of the manifold recompense, that induced Paul (see the ἵνα of ver. 18) to renounce his privilege and to remain a tentmaker. Render, **Now** or **yet all that I do, I do for the Gospel's sake.** Then comes a further definition; **in order that I may be a fellow-communicant (communer?) therein,** to wit, in the immortal contents of the divine message. Most admirable is this modesty and selfmistrust in an Apostle, who with indomitable zeal wrought harder than all others; the aim and apex of his long climbing toil is to share, if it may be so, in the grand redemption that is to be unveiled at the Parousia!

24. A latent fear of failure, not indeed of final salvation, but of the prerogative salvation to be revealed in the dawn of the Messianic Aeon, suggests this terse exhortation to moral energy, fruit of moral discipline. The figure is borrowed from the famous Isthmian games (see Smith's 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities'), a grand Panhellenic festival, triennial, held near Corinth.

Render, **Know ye not that they which run in a racecourse run all, but one taketh the prize? So run that ye overtake.**

*Overtake* (used absolutely) *what?* The other runners? Probably: the Greek amply sanctions this; numerous instances in the LXX, where this verb is often adjoined to the verb *pursue* and applied to *persons* chased and caught. If this view be right, the single winner here is a representative number, denoting the numerical unit of the first company of the redeemed, men of all times who in their course of probation, putting forth their full spiritual powers, overtake the multitude of moral laggards and in the end take the Messianic prize held out by the divine human umpire. In this grand race many run, few win; and the comparative few who do win have in strong faith trained long and wrought much; he who overtakes the mass, alone takes the prize. The text in paraphrase means, "As in a batch of competitors in a foot-race all indeed run, yet one only wins, the rest lose; but he who wins runs all the way with all his might so as to catch up and outstrip the rest, in like manner, *with such speed* (οὕτως) run ye, O Corinthians, *as* to overtake.

It may be, however, that St. Paul after *overtake* mentally supplied *the prize*. So all the commentators; in that case καταλάβητε may still be rendered *overtake*, the image now being that of men running towards the prize, as towards a mark not yet reached (Philipp iii. 14), or even chasing it as a quarry with the aim of overtaking. Or, "that ye *surely take*" or **secure**, may perhaps suit this view; *catch* is feeble, and *grasp* is not true to the word's idea: besides, in translation it is better to preserve the Pauline *paronomasia* or play upon words; of which we have a parallel instance in a parallel passage (Philipp. iii. 12): "Not that I have already *taken* or am already finished in my course, but I pursue if I may but *overtake*, seeing that I was also *overtaken* by Christ," i.e. in the miraculous surprise near Damascus.

According to this second view, the underlying doctrine, with a slight variation, will be this: the single winner in the race prefigures the one Church triumphant, the few chosen out of the many called, the first fruits of His resurrection who first rose from the dead, the alpha of the Alpha, the foremost conquering division or company (τάγμα, ch. xv. 23) of veteran saints in the salvable army of man-

Digitized by Google

run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain.

25 And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they *do it* to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible.

26 I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air:

27 But I keep under my body, and bring *it* into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.

---

kind, the peculiar people *zealous of good works*. To be enrolled in this *prærogativa centuria* or "assembly of the first-born" is the culmination of the recompense, to which St. Paul by dint of unpaid labour and by stress of gospel-work humbly aspires, leading the way himself and pointing it to others. He strives to overcome self that he may overtake the crown: that he may secure the imperishable crown of the Messianic salvation together with the regal office and the saintly assessorship with the divine king and the government of the nations and the subjugation of the Powers. "He that overcometh, to him I will give to sit with me . . . ." Rev. iii. 21.

Critical notes on ver. 24. *Taketh* better than "receiveth," A. V.: one may take without receiving; besides, the simple act of taking by him who runs is the true idea; and the *giver* of the pinewreath only comes to view in the next word βραβεῖον = *umpire's award*. *Took the prize* is a familiar English phrase. "So run that ye *may* obtain" can hardly be right: for *that* here denotes not the aim or end of running, but the contemplated result of the *manner and style* of running; the *so* makes all the difference; comp. 1 Thess. v. 5 "Ye are not in darkness that the day should overtake you as thieves:" subjectively ecbatic use of *that*. N. B. Observe here that ἵνα knows nothing of a *mixed use*, such as "combination of purport and purpose:" language is simple and one use at a time is enough for ἵνα. We do not speak in resultants.

**25.** But *training* comes before racing or boxing; self-restraint, spare diet, no wine for ten months. Even so in all holy competition moral discipline prepares for moral energy in the spiritual encounter. Render, **Every one, who will contend for the prize in all things practises self-control They of course, that they may take**—a pine-wreath—gathered from a neighbouring pine-grove. The μέν here does not associate with οὖν; see note on verses 4 and 7, ch. vi.

**26. I then**—who am an exemplar—**do so run not as** one who runs **with unsteady aim**—like some of you with a roving side-glance at an idol's temple (Chrysostom)—**so do I practise boxing as no air-striker, but**—the very reverse of hitting wide of the mark—**I bruise black and blue**—whom? my antagonist? Yes. What antagonist?—**my body, and lead it a slave in bonds** (so far in vehement incisive tones, now in modified or mournful accents), **lest so be after playing herald to others, I myself may turn out unapproved.**

Ὑπωπιάζειν = "to mark with livid lines under the eyes, to eye-blacken." This agonistic allegory should not be pressed too close: it is rather a cartoon of broad touches than a painting finished in detail. St. Paul appears in three dissolving views *runner, boxer, herald*: one duty of the herald was to proclaim the laws of the contest; the office of St. Paul was to preach the law of the Gospel; it is curious that in Herod. i. 21, *herald* and *apostle* are nearly synonymous.

*unapproved.*] The figure is, lest, when assayed in the testing fire of Messiah's advent, I be found of inferior moral metal, rather spurious than genuine, and so unqualified for admission into the first instalment of men redeemed, even the glorified Church.

---

## CHAPTER X.

1 *The sacraments of the Jews* 6 *are types of our's,* 7 *and their punishments,* 11 *examples for us.* 14 *We must fly from idolatry.* 21 *We must not make the Lord's table the table of devils:* 24 *and in things indifferent we must have regard of our brethren.*

MOREOVER, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea;

2 And were all baptized unto

---

CHAP. X. The Apostle returns from the long digression of Ch. IX. to the subject of idol-service. Call to mind, O Corinthians, what befell our fathers in the wilderness. They *all* came out of Egypt, and "there was not one stumbler among their tribes," Ps. cv. 37. They *all* underwent baptism unto Moses, and *all* ate the same food spiritual and drank



Digitized by Google

Moses in the cloud and in the sea;

3 And did all eat the same spiritual meat;

---

the same drink spiritual. Yet not all responded to God's 'purpose of grace:' some of them, indeed the greater part, fell by evil lust, by idolatry, by fornication, by sore tempting of the Lord, by murmurings against Jehovah and against their own theocratic leaders. Thus fell they: beware, O Corinthians, of a similar fall; you, like them, are lured back by the Egyptian savours of Corinthian license, are enticed by a surrounding polytheism. But still ye are not tempted beyond what ye are able to bear; and God, who for your probation assigns the temptation, will with the same appoint the way of escape. From all idol-service flee away: take warning and take courage: what happened to the wandering Hebrews, whether mercies or judgments, were patterns and outlines of what shall under like circumstances of stedfastness or of declension happen to yourselves. The Church of Christ has federal safeguards against relapses just as the congregation of Israel had: a common bond of union with Christ, and with each other, we all possess in the 'one bread which we break' and in 'the cup of the blessing,' even as our forefathers in the desert were associated together in one 'meat spiritual' and in one 'drink spiritual.' Their 'angel's food' was the same to them all, and our 'bread from heaven' is one to us all. And as that manna and that water, gifts common alike to all the sons of Israel, were intended to keep God's congregation one and undivided, so the one bread and the one cup are designed to be the means of keeping us all one body by union with the humanity of Christ. This holy fellowship with Christ and with one another is in its very nature indivisible; it is therefore utterly exclusive of a divided worship; it recoils from all dalliance with idols. Ye can no more be guests at the table of the Lord and at tables of demons, than ye can serve God and Mammon.

1. A good reason I have why I should exhort you to conquer self, even as I strive to conquer self by keeping under my body, lest I should prove disqualified for the prize of the great inheritance: consider what befell the mass of the Israelites; they were all, save two, rejected from entrance into the Land of Promise: *for I do not wish you to be* **unwitting** *that our* . . .

*our fathers.*] The ancestors of the Jews, of whom am I and some amongst you, O Corinthians. Moreover the Gentiles have taken the room of the Hebrews. *All* is emphatic, and four times repeated: it is contrasted with the *few* in whom God's purpose of good took effect, ver. 5; and it is also correlated with *the same* twice occurring in ver. 4.

The Apostle omits the *pillar of fire* as irrelevant to his argument and brings to view the *cloud* and the *sea:* these two, being 'moist elements' and aqueous natures, both together typify the water of baptism. We must not suppose, with some, that the cloud and the sea represent the two elements in Christian baptism, the cloud the heavenly or the Spirit, the sea the earthly or the water, because this idea would tend to confusion: for with what consistency can the cloud and the sea in the same clause typify the one a natural, the other a spiritual element?

The two phrases 'were under the cloud,' and 'passed through the sea,' seem to prefigure the double process of *submersion* and *emersion* in baptism. The analogue however is not to be pressed in the details, for neither rain from the cloud nor wave from the sea wetted the marching sons of Israel.

2. ἐβαπτίσαντο, **took baptism,** or it may mean *received baptism:* certainly not, as some, 'baptized themselves' nor, as Meyer, 'had themselves baptized:' both these renderings are against the true idea of the middle voice. *Unto Moses, i.e.* to obey Moses, in whom they trusted as God's servant and their own accredited leader. This baptism of the Exodus from Egypt, it may be noted, preceded the giving and teaching of the Law on Sinai: compare the antitype (Matt. xxviii. 19, *baptizing* them and *teaching* them).

On this verse Theodoret comments to this effect: 'The sea of transition represents the laver of regeneration, Moses foreshadows the true High Priest, his staff the cross, Israel the baptized, the pursuing Egyptians are a type of chasing demons, Pharaoh himself is an image of the devil.'

3. As the baptism unto Moses was a type of the true baptism into Christ, so the gifts of the manna and of 'streams in the desert' were figures of the body and the blood of Christ. The sacraments of the Old Testament are made by St. Paul to foreshadow the substance of two sacraments in the New, of two and no more.

The emphatic word *all* occurs several times. The children of Israel all without exception stood on the same level of divine favour: in His marvellous dealings God was one and the same to them all; to the standing and to the falling He was gracious alike, for as all took baptism in the cloud of the Exodus and in the passage through the Red Sea so

Digitized by Google

4 And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that [1]followed them: and that Rock was Christ.

[1] Or, *went with them.*

in the wilderness the same meat was common to them all and the same drink to all, both of divine origin. And, had they not murmured, had they but remained 'stedfast in the covenant,' the same prospect of reaching the Land of Promise was before them all. The mass of them, at least, might have entered Canaan; but in the mass of them, proving rebellious, 'God's purpose of good' failed to take effect.

*spiritual meat.*] The manna descended in the form of grains of corn (see *note on manna* at the end of Exodus ch. xvi.), and supplied the place of bread during the forty years. It came *like rain* out of the air and was unquestionably, like the column of cloud and of fire, of supernatural origin. But how *spiritual* or *spirit-wrought* meat? No doubt this 'corn of heaven' was in a way unknown to us given by Him who, fifteen centuries later, gave Himself the 'true Bread' from heaven. The Word, not yet incarnate, was ever moving in the midst of Israel. But this presence of Christ does not exclude the idea of angelic mediation. Inasmuch as the manna is called "the bread of angels," the power of the Word in this oft-repeated miracle may have been put forth by the mediation of angels ministering to Him: compare Jacob's Ladder. This idea is in keeping with the fact that the Law of Sinai was ordained by a twofold agency (1) of angels clustering in the foreground of Jehovah, (2) of Moses standing in the foreground of Israel; but as below Moses was the congregation, so above the angels was the Word and above the Word was God: see ch. iii. 22.

4. And it was *spiritual drink* that they all drank. Why *spiritual?* Because, as Bengel says, *qualis petra talis aqua:* **for they used to drink of a spiritual accompanying rock.** Most important to the sense of this passage is the difference between the tenses of ἔπιον and ἔπινον. The two tenses interpret each the other, and both together throw a considerable light upon the *perpetuity* of God's extraordinary dealings with Israel during the forty years. The aorist ἔπιον means **they drank throughout** from end to end of their wanderings. It refers here, as is plain from the Imperfect following it, not to a single instance of drinking, *e.g.* at Rephidim in Horeb, but to a series of instances regarded as one process: just like a chain seen at a distance from end to end, the links of which fail to strike the eye; or like a swiftly revolving wheel, the spokes of which disappear in the rapid whirling and the rotation seems to stand still. The Imperfect ἔπινον, on the other hand, means **they drank from time to time**: the several instances become visible; the wheel revolves more slowly and the spokes are distinguishable; the links of the chain come to view. From the grammatical structure, then, it is clear that the rock of Rephidim and the cliff in Kadesh were not the only occasions of the gift of water. Between these two recorded instances, comprising an interval of nearly forty years, during which the first rebellious generation died out, many rocks and cliffs must have been hallowed by the presence and vivified by the power of the Spiritual Rock accompanying the march of Israel. This view, which agrees with what is stated in this Commentary vol. i. part ii. p. 720, is rendered certain by these two tenses playing into each other, and equally so by the fact, well attested by travellers, of the arid and waterless nature of the Arabian Desert.

But what is the more precise meaning of the phrase *spiritual rock?* We know that Jehovah was 'in the pillar of smoke and of fire,' which was a 'pavilion round about Him' (Psalm xviii.), a holy veil woven out of the physical elements. By means of this opaque or luminous cloud, outwardly natural, inwardly supernatural, God manifested His own real presence, making darkness or light to His people. In a like mysterious manner the material rock of the desert, standing here or there, at Rephidim or in Kadesh or elsewhere, was made the vehicle of an extraordinary power of spirit permeating and quickening dead material, causing fresh springs to gush forth out of a dry ground. Chrysostom's comment is, "It was not *the nature* of the rock that sent forth the water, for *that* alone would never have bubbled up in streams, but it was another species of rock, even spiritual, that was ever ready to operate, i.e. **Christ**, who *in all places was present, and in all cases working wonders.*" Akin to these last words are the last words of the Wisdom of Solomon concerning Israel's God, who was ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ καὶ τόπῳ παραστατῶν.

*The rock*, **to wit,** *was Christ*, or **yea** *the rock was Christ.*] The water is termed 'spiritual drink,' inasmuch as it was called into existence by the living power of a spiritual rock. It welled forth indeed from a material rock, but it came not of the nature of the same but out of a higher nature called 'spiritual rock.' And this spiritual rock is termed Christ, because

Digitized by Google

5 But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness.

6 Now these things were [1]our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted.

[1] Gr. *our figures.*

7 Neither be ye idolaters, as *were* some of them; as it is written, [a]The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.

[a] Ex. 32. 6. Ps. 106. 14.

8 Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and [b]fell in one day three and twenty thousand.

[b] Num. 25. 9.

9 Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and [c]were destroyed of serpents.

[c] Num. 21. 6.

---

being the expression of His power it was Christ in effect: for He was the cause both of it and through its medium of the spiritual drink. The rock was therefore Christ in effect, and the effect is here designated by the name of its cause; a very common mode of speech: one instance of it is 'To depart from evil is understanding,' i.e. in effect, for understanding is a cause of departure from evil. This very common mode of speech arises simply from the fact that the cause is *in* its effect, or in the words of Hooker "every original cause imparts itself to those things which come of it."

It may be remarked that 'spiritual' in this verse cannot mean *typical*, as some, nor *miraculous*, as others: nor can 'was' signify *represented* or *prefigured*, as many. No doubt the 'meat and drink spiritual' were figures, if not analogues, of the Eucharistic flesh and blood of Christ, and perhaps indicate the spiritual nature of both the flesh and the blood. And if, as it is written in the heading of this chapter in the A. V., 'the sacraments of the Jews were types of ours,' then we must suppose that the children of Israel were unconscious of the sacramental import of their 'meat and drink spiritual,' and knew not that by them 'the Lord was healing them' (Hosea xi. 3).

The legend of the Rabbins, often quoted in comments upon this passage, that the water-yielding rock of Rephidim followed the Israelites all about in the desert, rolling like a round beehive or barrel of stone to the door of the tent, is a fable: a fable "simply founded upon a literal interpretation of certain rabbinical statements concerning the identity of the well at Rephidim with that at Kadesh. These statements were evidently intended to be figurative. Their true meaning was that those waters which flowed out in Horeb were the gift of God granted to the Israelites and continued through the desert, just like the manna. For wherever they went, fountains of living waters were opened to them, as occasion required. And for this reason the rock in Kadesh was identified with that in Horeb. Still less ground is there for supposing that St. Paul alluded to any such rabbinical fable in the words, They drank of a spiritual rock following them." The above from Keil on Pentateuch, vol. iii. p. 130. But even if this tradition was before the Apostle when he wrote this chapter, he illuminated it by a spiritual and corrective interpretation. His own forms of expression tend to verify the view that the guidance of Israel through the desert, the passage of the Red Sea and of the Jordan included, was a long succession of miracles: and so beyond question it was.

5. **But still not with most of them did God purpose for good.**] *Not with most*, tragic litotes, for *with very few*. Sense is; although God, who nourished and guided them all in the desert, had a gracious design for them all viz. that they should enter the Land of Promise, yet that *counsel for good* was frustrated in a murmuring majority. It took effect only in two males of the first generation, Caleb and Joshua.

[εὐδόκησεν, not as in A.V. 'was well pleased' but *decreed for good:* the εὖ here= the gift of the promised inheritance.]

6. *Now these things came to pass for outlines or marks belonging to us* to follow or to avoid, to follow the tracks of obedience and mercies, to avoid the footprints of rebellion and judgments.

7. *Neither* **become** *ye idolaters*, as the Israelites did, when they sat down at the idol-feast of the golden calf in Horeb. Beware, O Corinthians: even to partake of idol-meats is an implication in idol-service.

8. *three and twenty thousand.*] Numb. xxv. 9–10: where 24,000 is the number stated. St. Paul follows a Jewish tradition which deducted 1000, as being the number of those who were hanged by the judges: so that only 23,000 would be killed by the plague.

9. *Nor let us sorely tempt the Lord.*] ἐκπειράζωμεν, *try to the uttermost*, as the Israelites did, by their length of frowardness testing the tension of divine endurance, as curious to see at what point God would punish, or whether he would punish at all.

Digitized by Google

10 Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and [d]were destroyed of the destroyer.

[d] Num. 14. 37.

11 Now all these things happened unto them for [1]ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

[1] Or, *types.*

12 Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

13 There hath no temptation taken you but [1]such as is common to man: but God *is* faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear *it*.

[1] Or, *moderate.*

14 Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry.

15 I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.

16 The cup of blessing which we

---

Such rebels **perished from time to time** (ἀπώλλυντο) by the inflammatory bite **of the serpents** or 'burning snakes,' the καύσωνες or the *torrida dipsas* of Lucan, (Phars. ix. 718).

Application: be not ye also discontented, but accept the Christian's position of a pure and sober life, nor look back with longing upon what you have renounced for ever, those pleasures of Corinth which are as the flesh-pots of Egypt.

**10.** *Neither murmur ye.*] Change to the second person plural from the first of ver. 9, because the Apostle wishes to point an arrow at the party-spirit so rife in the Church. 'As they murmured against Moses and Aaron, so murmur not ye against Paul and Apollos.' See Numbers xvi. 41.

*of the destroyer.*] i.e. the angel commissioned by God to deal the pestilence.

**11.** 'Now all these things by way of outline or lesson happened one by one to *them*:' the word *them* emphatic: all these judgments left their prints behind them legible to us *unto whom the ends of the ages have reached* i.e. of the antediluvian, patriarchal, theocratic, world-periods.

**12.** Beware lest your arrogance and confidence fill up the sketch and outline of Israel in the desert. All growth in grace has its root in humility. So far I have said to you, Take warning: now I say, Take courage; for the same God, who is watchful that no temptation take you but such as is within man's compass to resist, is "**faithful** also **in that he** will not suffer you to be tempted beyond what ye are able (are in a position) to bear, but will make with the temptation the way of escape **also**." He who knows how to arrange the circumstances of a temptation for the strengthening of your moral powers of resistance, surely knows also how to arrange the proper exodus out of the same. Wherefore linger not in the temptation, but escape for your life: stop not to dally with idolatry but flee and flee away from it! (imperf. imperat.).

**15.** Render, **as being intelligent** men **I say** to you **Judge ye what I affirm.** *Ye* emphatic: for the construction see Ephes. v. 28. 'Husbands ought to love their own wives *as being* their own bodies.' The antitypes of the spiritual meat and drink of the Arabian desert now come to view. St. Paul has just been forbidding his readers even to tamper with the heathen feasts, such dalliance being dangerous, smacking of idolatry and decoying to apostasy. This prohibition he now enforces by shewing how solemnly binding to stedfastness in the faith is that holy fellowship of the Lord's Supper and that older one of the Jewish sacrifices.

**16.** *The cup* in its contents. *Which we bless*—i.e. more explicitly 'over which we speak the word *for good*': the word (λόγος), *for good* (εὖ). So in the Latin, *benedicimus* = we utter the word *bene* i.e. *bene fiat.* Cum Deus bene dicit, tum bene *est:* cum homo, tum ut bene *fiat.* God blesses man in deeds: for He speaks, and it is done: His benedictions are benefactions. Hence the phrase 'shall *inherit* the *promise*.' In the Holy Supper what is offered to God of His own earthly gifts, with the prayer that He bless it into an heavenly good, is given back by God in the new form and substance of the supernatural good itself. The divine *good* (εὖ) spoken over the elements is in the Holy Communion the same divine *good* (εὖ) appropriated and realised: and the bread and wine after their benediction or consecration (the two are often identified) are not indeed changed in their nature but become in their use and in their effects the very body and blood of Christ. This, of course, to the worthy receiver.

*The cup of the blessing* pronounced by Christ in His holy institution of the sacrament *which we bless*, when in the celebration we Apostles or our successors, Apollos and others, bless the cup in the words of the institution, *is it not* **communion in** *the blood of Christ?* i.e. the means of communion. The keyword communion (κοινωνία) never signifies, as Waterland and many insist, *communication*

Digitized by Google

bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?

---

(in the active sense) nor, as Meyer and others insist, *participation*. The Greek for 'participation' is μετάλημψις, for 'communication' perhaps ἀνακοίνωσις. Nowhere in the N. Testament, nor elsewhere apparently, has the word *either* of these meanings. It almost always means *fellowship* or *communion*—both the same—sometimes taking the more concrete sense of *community* or *society*. Even where it seems to denote 'contribution' (Rom. xv. 29), it does not properly mean 'communication,' but retains its essential sense of *fellowship*, which with the addition of the circumstantial sense amounts to the *expression of fellow-feeling* in the form of almsgiving: or, the same issue by another avenue, this is another instance of the frequent figure, the *effect* called by the name of the *cause*, as in the text "the rock was Christ" or as in the Psalm "He gave their labour (in effect), to the locust" or as in Ep. Rom. "the minding of the flesh is death" (in the issue). It may be remarked that the *breaking of bread* is called *communion* so early as Acts ii. 42, and *fellowship of one with another* is in 1 Joh. i. 7, associated with the "*blood* which cleanseth from all sin."

In this ver. 16 the meaning cannot be communion with the blood, as some say; for that is an incorrect idea. *Union* with the body and with the blood there is, but not communion: fellowship is with persons (1 Cor. i. 9) or with things personified (2 Cor. vi. 14): compare "We have fellowship with the Father and with the Son and with one another' (1 Joh. i.) This word *communion* generally denotes the *fellowship of persons with persons in one and the same object always common to all and sometimes whole to each*. By way of illustration: when the sun shines upon a band of haymakers in a field, these do not, properly speaking, *partake* of the sun: there is no true participation: we cannot say that a portion of ten beams is assigned to A, of twelve to B, of twenty to C: rather the undivided sun is common to all the labourers and whole to each of them: they all have a κοινωνία or common interest in one and the same sun. Even so Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, shines upon His own, equal to all and total to each. One more instance of this use from the Latin formula, Communio legis est communio juris = "an equal privilege of law is an equal enjoyment of right" (Forcellini).

*Communion of the blood* without the prefix of *the* (as in A.V.) is a good rendering, if *of* here denotes 'proceeding from' or 'in relation to:' something similar in construction is the phrase 'the death of the cross,' the cross being the instrumental cause of death Philipp. ii. 8. Similar too is the text Philippians ii. 1, "if there be any fellowship of Spirit:" which is well explained by one of the early Fathers *conjunctio animorum per communem Spiritum* or fellow-feeling wrought by one Spirit common to all: compare the explanatory word *likeminded* in next verse.

The sense then will be, *communion in relation to the blood with persons;* and these persons are divine and human, (1) the Father and the Son, (2) the members of Christ's body. This will become probable from the following considerations: communion is not the same thing with union,—but rather proceeds from it, growing out of our mystical union with Christ's humanity, whereby we are made "members of His body, bred of (ἐκ) His flesh and of (ἐκ) His bones" (Ephesians v. 30). This mystical union, founded in Baptism, is strengthened and consolidated in the Eucharist by means of mystical communion. And as the *union* itself is twofold, for thereby we are "members of Christ" and "members one of another" (Rom. xii. 5), so is the *communion* twofold, for thereby we have "fellowship with the (incarnate) Son" and "fellowship with one another." In like manner St. Paul's *peace* is twofold, viz. peace between Jew and Gentile and between both and God (Ephes. ii. 15). In favour of this view may be cited from Damascenus Orthod. Fid. lib. ix. c. 14, "It (the Eucharist) is called communion, because thereby we *commune with Christ*, while at the same time we *commune* and *are unified* (ἑνοῦσθαι) *with one another:* for since of one bread we *all as one* (οἱ πάντες) partake, we become one body of Christ and one blood and members of each other, and so are called concorporeal with Christ."

In tracing the right relation between the terms *communion* and *of the blood* or *in the blood*, it may be remarked that as 'communion' here denotes fellowship of the members both with the Head and with each other, so it implies fellowship in a *nature* common to all. Of this inner communion with Christ and with such as have been baptized into His divine-human nature the divine-human blood is the lifegiving *medium*. For in Baptism we "put on Christ" just as a graft by insertion *puts on a tree:* and as the graft *after* insertion drinks the sap of the tree or in the words of St. Paul "has *in common with the root* the fatness of the good olive" (συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἐλαίας, Rom. xi. 17), so in the Eucharist we drink

Digitized by Google

17 For we *being* many are one bread, *and* one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.

18 Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

---

the blood of Christ more truly than the graft drinks the sap of the tree in which it has been inserted. What a κοινωνία there is in a tree! Boughs and sprays in union and communion with each other and with the stem, all drawing the same nature and the same nourishment and the same substance from a common root.

This idea of *communion* or *fellowship*, with its inner teaching, may be made clearer by a parallel text from Ep. Heb. ii. 14, where the blood is mentioned before the flesh, as in this text of St. Paul it is before the body: "Forasmuch then as the children *have in common* with one another the nature *of blood and flesh* (κεκοίνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος), he also himself *took* of the same nature *with them*" (μετέσχε). That is, in the Incarnation He assumed our nature in its weakness of flesh, that He might first by suffering hallow it and by His bloody Passion consecrate it on the cross and by His resurrection exalt it to God's right hand and might then from heaven give it back to us in the Eucharist, to the end that we might become *possessors in common of a divine nature* (κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως, not, as in A. V., 'partakers of *the* divine nature' or Deity): in other words, that we might become *fellows with Him* and with one another in His own Humanity, enriched with new qualities and ennobled with divine attributes, even with "all the complement of the Godhead corporeally" (Ep. Col. ii. 9). For He condescended to *fellowship with us in* our humiliated humanity in order that we might be 'exalted exceedingly' to brotherhood and *fellowship with Him in* His glorified Humanity. Similarly Chrysostom makes our Lord say, 'I have become a fellow with you (κοινωνός) in flesh and blood for your sakes: again that Flesh and Blood, by which I have become akin to you, I give back to you."

*The bread which we break* after consecration or benediction *is it not* (the medium of our) *communion* (with one another) *in the body of Christ?*] *Christ* with emphasis. The sense seems to be: As the material bread, God's earthly gift, we do eat together with 'the outer man,' so the 'spiritual food of Christ's most precious body,' God's gift from heaven, we receive together and manducate with 'the inward man' (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος of St. Paul); the natural bread after consecration being not only the symbol, but also the vehicle (in effect) of Christ's body (in essence). How often in Scripture is the natural consecrated to be the medium of the supernatural! And there is always a congruity and meetness of correspondence between the outward sign and the inner thing signified. The material rock gushing with streams in the desert was a vehicle of a spiritual rock, even Christ in effect. The sacred animal breath which our Lord breathed on his disciples was not only the meet emblem, but true vehicle also of Holy Spirit; for 'He *blew* or breathed stedfastly on them and said Take Holy Spirit,' and they received His sensible breath, and with it the gift of His own Spirit (Joh. xx. 22.)

**17. Because** (there is) **one bread, one body are we the** (assembled) **many.** The sense is, Because the bread of many parts, into which it is broken, is yet one bread, one body are the many we. Many fractions, one bread: many members, one body. Comp. Ignatius ad Ephes.: 'Ye all individually come together in common in one faith and in one Jesus Christ, *breaking one bread* which is the medium of immortality, our antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ.'

It is worthy of note how St. Paul makes an easy transition from the *body proper* of Christ (ver. 16) to the *corporate body*, the Church (ver. 17). This is remarkable, as tending to shew that he identifies the two bodies in essence or substance. He certainly seems to do so in Ep. Col. ii. 19, 'The Head, *out of* whom (as out of a well-spring of vital forces and divine energies) all the body through all the touches or points of contact with the head and through common ligaments binding the members to each other (a two-fold means of union) is furnished with large supplies of nourishment and is coarticulated (Ephes. iv. 16) and compacted together into a living organism.' This inner teaching of St. Paul stands out clearer in the famous text 'We are members (mystical) of *His* body (proper), members *bred of* His flesh' (Ephes. v. 30).

In accord with this interpretation, which seems obvious from St. Paul's easy gliding here from the Christ's body to the Church-body, many ancient Fathers held that while in Baptism we obtain *incorporation* into Christ, in the Eucharist we receive also by degrees and rudimentally *concorporeity*, if not consanguinity, with Him. Two instances of this: "The Church (is) one body, not only generally and mystically, but properly and corporeally, because all are really (realiter) united to Christ" (Chrysostom). Again, "In sacra communione fimus non

Digitized by Google

tantum Christiferi sed et concorporei et consanguinei Christi" (Cyril of Salem). Augustine says well, "Non quod cernitur sed quod creditur pascit." True: but as the bread *quod cernitur* is a substance, so the Body *quod creditur* is a substance too.

It appears then from this text compared with others of St. Paul, that there is an identity of nature and substance in Christ Himself and in His members mystical, just as there is (to quote another familiar figure of the Church) an identity of material in the one binding Corner-stone and in the growing Superstructure of the whole Building, the material of both alike being heaven-quarried and spiritual.

*for we are all partakers of.*] [μετέχομεν rather means "have with one another." No partitive sense in μετέχειν: the μετὰ here points to ἀλλήλων not expressed, just as in Heb. ii. 14 μετέσχε = '*took* the same nature *with the children*.' But what does the exceptional, if not wholly unexampled, presence of ἐκ with μετέχειν here denote? Probably what comes out of the one bread, the *effects* thereof.]

The sense and connection of the whole then will be, *Because one bread* there is, *one body are we* the assembled *many*, the many-membered congregation, i. e. 'all the whole Church' in miniature; one body, *for we the* (collective) *all have together* the effects *of the one bread.* More fully, "for we all as one have received together out of the one sacramental bread, as from the material cause, the spiritual food of the very body of Christ." *How* the sacramental bread becomes in its use and effects the body of Christ, is a thing that passes all understanding: *the manner* is a mystery: Sanguine de Christi lis est, de corpore lis est, Deque *modo* lis est—non habitura modum: and no wonder; for the mode is a depth beyond all sounding.

It should be noted that οἱ πάντες = not 'all,' as in A. V., but *all as one*, or *all the whole* congregation, as it is happily rendered in our Communion Service, 'That we and *all thy whole Church* may obtain remission of our sins.' Some make the unity of the bread here refer not to number but to quality: so Meyer. But this idea rather mars the harmony of the general argument, which is that the correlative oneness to allness in the consecrated bread and cup simply excludes the very idea of federal unfaithfulness in the communicant. There must not be now a mind for the Table of the Lord, now a mind for the table of demons, nor any retrospective hankering after idol-feasts. It may be added that Augustine's notion that 'as one loaf is made up of many grains of corn, so one body is composed of many members, &c.' is a notion alien to the connection. The logical connection is, 'Because there is one bread of many fractions, one body are we the many membered totality; and one body are we, because we all, as one whole, have received the very body of Christ, as the mystical effect of the one bread.' In this passage, the prominent phrases *one body* and *the many we* and *the total we* suggest that 'fellowship of the members with one another' is the dominant idea in the writer's mind: fellowship or communion with Christ stands in the background.

18. Connection: not only that sacramental Feast of the Eucharist, which strengthens and quickens the holy fellowship of the guests with each other and with their unseen divine Host, is a means of communion and a seal of solidarity, but also the Jewish sacrificial feasts of old were. Both alike are dissuasives from idolatry.

*Israel after the flesh.*] *I.e.*, the Jews proper, members of the Theocracy. "The Levitical sacrifices were outward acts for maintaining membership in the commonwealth of Israel in the sphere of the *flesh*, *i.e.*, natural and earthly life consecrated to God." Delitzsch, Hebr. ii. p. 95.

*Partakers of the altar* can hardly be a right rendering; for κοινωνὸς nowhere seems to mean *partaker*; even in Æschyl. Agam. 1004 κοινωνὸς χερνίβων = 'with *a common property or interest* in the lustral water' or 'with an equal right to it with others.'

The sense in this text is, **Are not they who eat the sacrifices fellows** (or associates) **in relation to the altar of sacrifice?** Clearly a double connection here, (1) between the sacrifices and the sacrifical altar, θυσίας and θυσιαστηρίου; (2) between the act of eating and the act of communing or holding fellowship. Bengel seems to go wrong when he explains, "He to whom the offering is made, and the offering itself, and the altar which bears the offering, these three have communion." Between these three there is a connection indeed, but no communion. For here, as in ver. 16—see note there—the true idea is not 'participation' nor 'communication,' but 'fellowship of persons with persons,' communion (1) of men with God (2) of men with one another as members of one holy congregation. And 'the sacrifices,' while they are being eaten, are the medial cause of this communion, as the sacrificial altar is the local and instrumental. There is no such thing as communion *with an altar* or *with a victim:* rather it is by means of both *with God.* No wonder some, who make κοινωνοὶ = μέτοχοι, ask 'why did not Paul write Θεοῦ instead of θυσιαστηρίου'? While others to *altaris* affix *Deique*, to make out the sense.

Digitized by Google

19 What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?

20 But *I say*, that the things which the Gentiles [a]sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.

[a] Deut. 32. 17. Ps. 106. 37.

---

The truth seems to be that in the Levitical sacrifices there was communion between Jehovah on the one hand and the priests and worshippers on the other. This communion was effected by means of the slain bullock in the Peace offering, for instance, or *θυσία σωτηρίου*. The slain bullock in the burning of the fat or suet *furnished food of firing* for Jehovah, who by fire consumed His portion of the sacrifice: the same victim also *furnished food of flesh* hallowed by the altar, to the priest and worshippers; who in this feast common to all were fellow-guests with one another and with God. This common feast was a sacrificial meal *after* the sacrificial offering. In like manner the blood, after its *ef*fusion from the body of the bullock in the slaughtering (comp. Luke xxii. 20), was *af*fused or poured against the altar (*προσεχύθη πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον* LXX.) *for atonement*, and then, hallowed by the altar, was given back in the form of sprinkling upon the people *for cleansing*. Thus the same animal, slain and sacrificed, was from the altar given back both in its *blood* and in its *flesh* to the priest and the people. The blood of the victim was regarded as *one* blood, although it was set in bowls by the priest in two halves, one half for affusion to make atonement and to propitiate or bring God *nigh* to His people, the other half for the aspersion of cleansing to make the people meet for drawing nigh to their God. Thus the altar, on which the victim was given to Jehovah and from which it was given back to the offerers, was a meeting-place of communion between God and His people; and the substantial medium of this personal communion was (1) all of the common sacrifice that was consumed by the fire of Jehovah, (2) all that was eaten by the worshippers: by means of the first God held or celebrated a federal feast of holy fellowship with men, by means of the second men with God and with one another. The idea then of the rendering *partakers of the altar* is simply incorrect on these grounds as well as on grammatical. A careful study of the Jewish sacrinces in the light of this text will repay labour, for it seems to be a text bearing much upon the Holy Supper, as that *κοινὸν δεῖπνον* of Chrysostom, "wherein it cannot be that of the master's gifts one domestic receives and another receives not, but all alike receive of what is common to all." According to St. Paul the Eucharistic Feast is an antitype of the sacrificial meal of the Peace-offering here as it is of the Passover in ch. 5. And from the significant word *altar of sacrifice* it seems as if the Apostle's thought was that the flesh of Christ, as given back from the altar of the Cross, is the medium of communion in the eating thereof and the real and therefore spiritual food of His Body, by feasting on which we have fellowship with Himself and with one another and through Himself with God. His human nature then of flesh and blood is the *res sacramenti* or '*thing* signified:' and the *virtus sacramenti* or 'remission of sins and all other benefits of His Passion' is that which is given through the *res:* and the *res* is the effect, *how* produced we know not, of the consecrated bread and wine. This being true, it follows that the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice, save in the offering of self-dedication and of God's creatures of bread and wine, but a sacramental Feast upon the great sacrifice which was once for all offered to God upon the altar of the Cross.

**19.** "Does it not shame you, O Corinthians, to roll back to the chalice of idols from this chalice which emancipated you from idols?" (Theophylact.)

Render:—**What therefore do I affirm?** —Connection: from the two Christian and Jewish sacrificial feasts of holy fellowship, which I just now adduced as analogues of 'the spiritual meat and drink' in the desert, do you raise the question whether there may not be another analogue in the Heathen sacrificial feasts? Nay, do I affirm—**that what has been sacrificed to an idol is something?** *τὶ* rather than *τι*. That it is an *aliquid?* That it is something or other, what the heathen may think it to be, a meat consecrated to a god? I tell you, it is a mere piece of flesh and nothing more. "That bread and that cup of ours are what they are and something more" (Bengel). **Or that an idol is something?** Is some god or other, Zeus or Aphrodite or Apollo, corresponding to the heathen's conception of it? It is not the carpenter nor the statuary that makes gods out of wood or stone: who then? Qui fingit sacros auro vel marmore voltus, Non facit ille deos; qui *colit*, ille *facit:* Martial Epigr. An idol is nothing; no god at all except in the imagination.

**20. Nay but** (what I do affirm is) **that what things the Gentiles sacrifice, to demons they sacrifice and to a no-god.** Not only to what is no-god do they sacrifice but to demons who behind the screen and

Digitized by Google

21 Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.

22 Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?

23 All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not.

24 Let no man seek his own, but every man another's *wealth*.

25 Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, *that* eat, asking no question for conscience sake:

---

curtain of idol-worship are busy in their work of ruin to the souls and bodies of men who serve images. Sense is: while you offer to what you think to be a god, you are really offering to a *vanity*, a *nonentity of a god: that* would be harmless by comparison: but here comes the grave mischief; you *at the same time* lay your souls open to the enticements of demons and your bodies to their obsessions.

The ordinary way of rendering this clause 'to demons and not to God' cannot be right. *And not to God* ('as you ought'—Bengel) is a negative addition simply not needed: it encumbers the march of the argument: moreover it seems quite certain that St. Paul here had in his mind Deuter. xxxii. 21: "They aroused my jealousy by *a no-god*, provoked me by their *vanities:* and I also will arouse their jealousy by *a no-people*, provoke them by a foolish nation," i. e. the future Gentiles. The Greek too of the LXX. bears out this rendering, for the οὐ θεῷ after δαιμονίοις in ver. 17 is explained in its sense by the ἐπ' οὐ θεῷ and the ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει of ver. 21. Nothing can be clearer. Compare Οὖτις or *Noman* of the Odyssey, and ἐν ἀβάτῳ καὶ οὐχ ὁδῷ, LXX.

**Demons**, (not, as in A. V., *devils*) are agents of the devil, moving in his kingdom of darkness, dwelling in the air near the earth. Some of them are, says Josephus, 'disembodied spirits of wicked men,' some mischievous, some malignant; others are described by Justin Martyr in a passage bearing on this text as "Evil demons who in times of old," just before the flood, "assuming various forms so astonished mortal minds with the wonders which they displayed that men *not knowing them to be evil demons styled them gods* and addressed them by the name which each demon imposed upon himself" (Apol. p. 55, Paris ed.)

*and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.*] The A. V. gives the right sense of κοινωνός at last: still rather render, **now I do not wish you to become fellows with the demons**, i. e. to become associates with that class of beings called demons (force of article), to enter into fellowship with them by attending idol-feasts, the haunt of evil spirits.

**21.** Sense is: it is morally impossible for you to drink the cup that brings into communion with the Lord, i. e. Christ, and to drink the cup that brings into fellowship with demons.

*be partakers of the Lord's table.*] Literally 'to have with others *of* the table.' S. Coena convivium est, non sacrificium: in mensa, non altari (Bengel). True: for it is a sacramental Feast after the Sacrifice: the Feast is held at the Table of the Lord often, the Sacrifice was made upon the Altar of the Cross once for all.

**22.** Render, **Or do we exasperate the Lord to jealousy?** 'Or (dreadful alternative!) are we just doing what Israel did of old in the Desert, embittering the Lord to jealousy?' See Deut. xxxii. 21. . . , *Really! are we stronger than He?* Don't say that! An *abductio ad absurdum*.

**23.** St. Paul now returns to the principle of Christian *license in things indifferent*, see vi. 12, presenting it more from its pure ethical side. See the counterpart of this in Rom. xiv. 13–20, and notes there.

*All things are* . . .] Render, **All things are permitted me, but still not all things edify**: i.e. build up the Christian life of the brethren. See ch. vi. 12. *All things are permitted me* seems to have been a sort of watchword or motto used by the Pauline party in Corinth: see note ch. viii. 8. Sense then is: 'All things indifferent are allowed me,' boasts the self-styled Pauline: 'True,' replies the Apostle, 'but nevertheless not all things indifferent *edify;*' or as in vi. 12, 'are conducive to the welfare of others.'

**24.** Render, **Let no one seek his own but every one another's** (*interest*). Here "another's,"=" his neighbours," for in the eye of charity *who is another is a brother*. Supply the word *every one* from the preceding *no one:* very common ellipse. Comp. Horace, Qui fit, Mæcenas, ut *nemo* followed by laudet (*quisque*).

**25.** Render, **Anything that is on sale in the meat market eat ye, making no inquiry from regard to conscience:** i. e. not stopping to consult conscience: in this

Digitized by Google

*f* Deut. 10. 14. Ps. 24. 1.

26 For *f* the earth *is* the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.

27 If any of them that believe not bid you *to a feast*, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake.

28 But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for *g* the earth *is* the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:

*g* Deut. 10. 14. Ps. 24. 1.

29 Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another *man's* conscience?

30 For if I by [1] grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?

[1] Or, *thanksgiving*.

31 Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.

32 Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the [1] Gentiles, nor to the church of God:

[1] Gr. *Greeks*.

---

instance conscience is, like Camarina, "better undisturbed." Chrysostom's view, followed by many, is clearly wrong, for the negative μὴ covers the whole participial clause, although in the next verse it covers only the verb following. Sense and connection are; in eating meat bought in the market raise no scruples, for all meat is the gift of God: "the earth is the Lord's and *the fulness* thereof."

26. *Fulness*, or *pleroma*='complement' in active sense. Not uncommon this sense (Euripides has λογχαὶ δεσποτῶν φρουρήματα). This word in Ephes. i. 23 is used to describe the Body as *the complement* without which the Head would be imperfect as Head: hardly *receptacle*, as Bp. Ellicott in his notes there. In ancient times oars, tackling, sailors were called *the complement of a galley:* chairs, tables, bedsteads, carpets may be termed the pleroma of a house: in like manner herbs, fruits, fish, fowl, 'the cattle on a thousand hills' belong to the pleroma of the earth.

27, 28. Render, **If an unbeliever invites you** (several of you Christians) **and you consent to go, anything that may be set before you eat ye, making no inquiry from regard to conscience: if, however, some one** (of your fellow-guests, a weak Christian or a possible convert) **should say to you, This is sacrificial meat, forbear ye to eat from regard to the informant and to conscience: now by conscience I mean not one's own but the other's.** *One's own*, i.e. the conscience of the Christian guest who has been warned *what* the meat just offered to him is: *the other's*, *i.e.* of him who gave the warning, the informant's.

*for why is my liberty.*] *My* because St. Paul descriptively puts himself in the place of the guest who has been warned against a sacrificial meat. The sense is, 'If I, one of several Christian guests in a mixed company in Corinth, were told by a neighbour—say a weak brother or a possible convert—that such and such a dish contained sacrificial meat, I should in that case forbear to eat of it out of respect to my informant and more especially (καὶ) from regard to his conscience: not at all from his regard to my conscience, lest it should be troubled from eating sacrificials; for why is my liberty in matters indifferent to be judged or determinated by *another* conscience, which happens to differ from my own in taking a narrower view of a Christian's liberty in these indifferent things?

30. **If I with grace** (*said*) **have** *meat* **with others** (μετέχω), **why am I evil spoken of** *for having meat* **for which I have said grace?** χάριτι='with grace in the heart,' properly with *thanks felt:* the verb denotes *thanks given for God's gifts* (εὐ). Emphasis to be laid on the double *I*.

31. *therefore*] An inference of the general from the particular. *Or whatsoever ye do.* Surely this is a correct, even happy rendering, for εἴτε τι may be said to = ὅ τι τε. See an exact Latin parallel in *sive* meaning *or if* (Hor. Odes. I. xv. 25), where the *si* belongs to the subordinate and the *ve* to the principal clause. This as against Alford's alteration: nor can Meyer be right when he makes the first *do* emphatic: *whatsoever* and *all* are rather emphatic.

*to the glory of God.*] Using His gifts aright, consulting the true welfare of others, now eating, now not eating, according to the social context. All Christian conduct redounds to his glory.

32. *Give none offence.*] Literally, **behave** (γίνεσθε) **without offence given to . . .** *i.e.* 'so as to place no moral *obstacle* before.' . . . The three classes here specified are set on the same level as to the general rule: no occasion of stumbling to any one is to be created by the conduct of any Christian.

Digitized by Google

33 Even as I please all *men* in all *things*, not seeking mine own profit, but the *profit* of many, that they may be saved.

33. *I please.*] Rather, **I am ready to oblige**: the tense is present imperfect: comp. Acts xxvi. 28, "In a trice thou *thinkest to persuade me* to turn Christian" (πείθεις). *In all things*, i.e. in all indifferent things.

*the profit of many.*] Render, **that of the many.**

*that they*, the many, *may be saved.*] This is the aim and end of all my doings, whether I preach the Gospel or bow to the customs of men in *adiaphora*.

## CHAPTER XI.

1 *He reproveth them, because in holy assemblies* 4 *their men prayed with their heads covered, and* 6 *women with their heads uncovered,* 17 *and because generally their meetings were not for the better but for the worse, as* 21 *namely in profaning with their own feasts the Lord's supper.* 23 *Lastly, he calleth them to the first institution thereof.*

BE ye followers of me, even as I also *am* of Christ.

2 Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the [1]ordinances, as I delivered *them* to you.

[1] Or, *traditions*.

3 But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman *is* the man; and the head of Christ *is* God.

4 Every man praying or prophe-

CHAP. XI. Contents: women should veil their faces in public assemblies for divine worship. The Agapae or love-feasts are not to be abused but reverentially celebrated

1. Render, **Prove or shew yourselves imitators of me as I also of Christ.** Christ is the highest Examplar: do ye copy in your lives my copy of the Original. I strive to please others (x. 33) after His pattern, who "pleased not himself" (Rom. xv. 3).

2. Render, **ye hold fast the delivered instructions in what spirit I delivered them to you:** namely directions in matters of discipline as well as of doctrine. These were given orally at Corinth, or possibly written in the lost letter.

3. **Now I wish you to know that of every man the Head is Christ, as head of the woman is the man, as Head of Christ is God.** The ranks and relations of Christian fellowship, as organised on the basis of redemption, are here brought forward: see Ephes. v. 21.

In this climax Christ is the centre, the middle between God and man: from Him the line of gradation descends to man and ascends to God. On the doctrine of the last clause see notes ch. iii. 23.

The particle δὲ may be rendered *likewise* or *again*.

*Head* in metaphorical sense: as in the body the members are subject to the head, so in the family to the husband, so in the state to the king, so in the Church to Christ: and Christ Himself is subordinate to the Father. *Deus est caput Christi: hoc non de essentia dicitur sed de ministeriis. Filius saepe inquit, Pater misit me. Fit hic mentio non arcanae essentiae sed ministerii* (Melanchthon.)

4. *dishonoureth*] Rather **putteth to shame** *or* **maketh ashamed.** Which of the two heads? Certainly the spiritual Head, even Christ. This view is favoured by the preceding context, where the clause *of every man the head is Christ* is the principal, the two next clauses being rather subordinate: for the particle δὲ does not always usher in a coordinate clause. Wherefore the connexion is, "Of every man the Head is Christ: **every man when he prays in the church or discourses in Spirit with veil** (hanging) **from head puts to shame his Head,** or *the Head of Him: Head* with emphasis, *him* without emphasis, as in the phrase 'the *life* of me.' Literally, 'wearing (something) *down from* head.' The veil was probably a large lap or loose fold of a body-shawl thrown over the left shoulder and so arranged as to fall down *over the face*. The head was to be covered that the face might be concealed. See two other views on this verse in a Note at the end of the chapter.

But, it may be asked, *how* may a man by wearing a veil in the holy assembly be said to put Christ to shame? Or, to put the question in another form, why should a man not appear veiled on the ground that he is next under Christ his Head, and yet a woman appear veiled on the ground that she is next under man her head? The idea seems to be this: the veil, a badge of subordination in the wearer, is worn by an inferior when he

Digitized by Google

sying, having *his* head covered, dishonoureth his head.

5 But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with *her* head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven.

6 For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.

7 For a man indeed ought not to cover *his* head, forasmuch as he is the

---

stands visible before his visible superior. In 'the glorious company of heaven' angels in the presence of God veil their faces; in the holy congregations of earth woman veils her face in the presence of man, her visible superior: but man does *not* veil, because Christ his immediate superior is not *visibly* present. For a veil is a symbol, that is *seen*, of subjection to one who is *seen:* and therefore in a public assembly for divine worship if a man appeared with face mantled, such a ritual would be on his part an irreverence and a disrespect to his spiritual Head, inasmuch as it would amount to an acknowledgment of subordination not to Christ who is *not* seen but to some one who *is* seen, that is to man. A man veiled makes himself level with a veiled woman and, like her, confesses the headship of man, thereby contemning the headship of Christ. Ritual is an expression of the moral and should correspond to it.

Render, **Whereas every woman praying aloud or discoursing in Spirit with unveiled head puts to shame the head of her, for she is one and the same** (class) **with a woman shaven.** The Apostle reprobates the disuse of the veil by the Corinthian women as implying an assumption on their part of equality with the other sex. In ch. xiv. 34 *silence* is imposed on women, but *there* in the full congregation: *here* in less formal meetings for devotion, e. g. in a church held in a house xvi. 19, they are allowed to pray aloud and to utter inspirational discourses: no contradiction between the two texts.

A lash of sarcasm in the sharp words, "for she is not a whit better than a woman shaven." Full sense is: appearing with her head unveiled "she shames the *head* of her" i. e. the man, for she at once casts off his proper headship when she lays aside her proper head-dress. If she repudiates the veil in church, she repudiates in church the very badge of her subjection. Nay, when she strives in the public eye to stand equal with man her lord, why should she not sink in the public eye to a level with a woman who is *shaven?* she is to all appearance at least no better than she ought to be, even an adulteress (shaven crowns were the penalty of shamelessness in married women). In asserting the equality of her own sex she disgraces the other sex doubly, both by disclaiming the *principatus* of man in relation to woman and by exposing to obloquy her own character: for her face bare and unveiled in church tends to attaint her of moral barefacedness.

**6.** Another lash of censure: sarcastic reason for sarcastic statement: 'for if she takes one false step in discarding the veil, let her be consistent throughout and take the next step in the same direction, *clipping her locks and shaving her crown* forsooth! Let her part with nature's veil as well as with the artificial! So far an *argumentum ad absurdum:* now comes the alternative of escape from such degradation step by step expressed in serious vein of exhortation: 'If however it is a shameful thing to a woman to clip her tresses or to submit to tonsure let her *veil her face* in religious assemblies.'

The verbs in this verse are all in the *middle voice*, not in the passive as in A. V.: and the words 'covered' and 'uncovered' should be rendered *veiled* and *unveiled*, for a woman may *cover her head* with a turban and yet not *conceal her face* with a veil. Render with emphasis on *not* (οὐ after εἰ; see note on ch. vii. 9), **For if a woman do not veil, let her also clip** (*tresses*); **if however it is a shame to a woman to clip** (*her tresses*) **or to shave** (*her crown*), **let her veil.** For ξυρᾶσθαι, mid. voice ='to submit to tonsure,' see Micah i. 16, LXX. Plus est *radi* quam *tonderi* (Grotius). The Greeks sacrificed bareheaded, the Romans *velati* (Vergil, Æneid iii. 406, assigns a reason for this custom): the Jewish men prayed with head covered, nay more, *with a veil* (*tallith*) *before the face*, Lightfoot Hor. Hebr. p. 210.

**7.** Additional reason for the advice *Let the woman veil.* St. Paul has already argued that, if to appear veiled in the congregation betokens the presence of a visible superior and to appear not veiled the non-presence, then a woman should always appear veiled, a man never. He has also with a dash of satire indicated the impropriety, and indecency even, of *physical* barefacedness as leading to the inference of *moral*—in a city like Corinth. He now proceeds to assign a third reason for this ritual distinction of head-gear. The logical connexion of the whole sentence from *v.* 7 to *v.* 10 entirely depends upon a right appreciation of the particles μέν and δέ: for clearly the δέ ushers in the *principal clause*

Digitized by Google

image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.

8 For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.

---

which states in conjunction with some subordinate clauses a new reason why *woman should wear a veil.* Parallel to this argument, and supporting it, runs another negative argument, shewing why a *man* should *not* wear a veil. The negative is intended to set off the positive. The sentences are somewhat involved, but the argument is simple. Render, **Let a woman veil; for whereas man is not bound to veil his head, seeing that he is God's image and glory, yet woman is man's glory** (and not his image), and **for this cause** (διὰ τοῦτο, *v.* 10) **bound is the woman to wear upon the head authority,** *i.e.* a badge of man's God-assigned power over woman. In the above sentence verses 9 and 10 are clauses inserted by the way, simply to shew *how* it is that woman is man's glory, and no more than man's glory. The tracery or anatomy of the whole argument is, in other words, this: Let woman in church cover head and conceal face in the presence of man; for this ritual of making head and face invisible is on her part a silent confession of real subordination to her visible Head and Principal. The subordination itself has its foundations planted deep in man's *principatus*, or lordship by creation; *how* thus founded deep therein, is explained *obiter* in verses 8 and 9: the woman therefore is *morally bound* (ὀφείλει) to exhibit in public worship the public token of her constitutional subjection to man. Man on the other hand, Christ his Head and Principal *not* being *visibly* present in the assembly, is *not* morally bound to wear in such assembly the ritual badge of his own fundamental subordination to Christ.

Render οὐκ ὀφείλει 'is *not* bound' rather than 'ought not,' as in A. V. Ὑπάρχων = 'being *constitutionally*, in his beginning at creation.'

*God's image and glory.*] For a profound attempt to elucidate these mysteries of creation, see Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychology p. 127 ff., E.T. *Imago* is an abbreviation of *imitago*, something more than *imitatio:* not as one orange is a likeness of another: it means a copy of an archetype, Petav. (de Trin.): as, for instance, the sovereign's head on a coin (Matt. xxii. 20) or the sun's reflection in water (Phædo, 99 d.). A cathedral in photograph is a copy of a copy: for it is an image of a cathedral in stone, and this again is an image of the original pre-existing in the mind of the architect. God is both the architect and, within due limits, the archetype of man. But the relation between the two consists in something more than similitude, even in affinity of essence. For man is the *image of God* by virtue of his *spiritual nature*, which because of the primal inbreathing (Gen. ii. 7) is *akin to the divine;* for when the body of Adam was formed from the dust, 'then the Lord God breathed into it the *created*, but *God-like* and *God-related*, breath of life.'

*and the glory of God.*] How was man created the *glory* of God? The divine *doxa* or *glory* itself is the eternal self-manifestation to the Triune God of His own holy nature, His *form* of light (Philipp. ii. 16), the εἶδος probably of John v. 37, the Divinity (θειότης) or effluence and expression of Deity (θεότης). In the divine counsel of creation this inner self-manifestation was to become an outer manifestation filling all creation. But it was through man, the created lord of the created cosmos, that the glory of God was to be communicated to the cosmos. This glory was from heaven to be reflected in him, the representation of God in the universe, the connecting link between heaven and earth, and from him the head of all creation to be again reflected in all creation subordinated to him. As this derived glory, to be mirrored from man in the surrounding cosmos, was to be the effluence of the self-manifested divine doxa, which is itself the eternal effluence and expression of enshrined Deity; so man in his higher nature of spirit, inbreathed into him from Spirit, was created *actually* the *image* of God, but in his lower nature of body, moulded from earth, was created *potentially* the *glory* of God, that is, constituted with the possibility, contingent on obedience, of a glorified body and soul and spirit. Adam's spirit, "the light of the Lord in him" kindled from the divine nature, was to become a light of glory, to be communicated to Eve, and from both progenitors to pass on to the human race and to lighten with this glory of theirs all creaturely existence. The design was baffled by Satan for a season. Meanwhile humiliated in body, yet now transformed in spirit, fallen man awaits in faith and in hope the unveiling of the 'new creation' in Christ and his own bodily assimilation to the body of *His* glory, the effects of the Parousia. Adam was not *qua* body made in the likeness of God, but *qua* spirit: the *image* was *in esse*, the *glory in posse.* See Bibl. Psych. p. 85.

8. Connection: man by original constitution (ὑπάρχων) is actually God's image and potentially His glory, the human embodiment and centre of a divine radiation to the uni-

Digitized by Google

9 Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.

10 For this cause ought the woman to have [1]power on *her* head because of the angels.

11 Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the

[1] That is, *a covering, in sign that she is under the*

verse: woman is neither God's image primally nor even His glory: she is *man's* glory; *for man is not of woman, but woman of man.* It is true she has, like man, the spirit in the divine image: but she has it not immediately from God, but *mediately from God through man.* Her flame of life is kindled at *his* "lamp of the Lord." She came absolutely *out of* the man (ἐξ ἀνδρός), flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone. And not only was she framed *out of* him, but also created *for* him: woman has in man both the *initial* and the *final* cause of her being. Her relation to him is a figure of the mystical relation of the church to Christ, that of the *pleroma* or complement. She was therefore *made for man,* that she might fill to the full his measure of happiness, otherwise incomplete. Woman, like man, is "light in the Lord" (Ephes. v. 8), but a lesser light than man; so Grotius, minus aliquid viro, ut *luna lumen minus sole.* The sun may be called the glory of the supreme source of all light and the moon the reflected glory of her source of light, the sun.

10. *For this reason a women is morally bound to wear authority upon the head.*] Strong emphasis upon *ought* or *is bound,* for the connection clearly is in full; 'Wherefore if the man is by creation God's image and God's glory, whereas the woman is by transmission through the man God's image and by derivation from the man man's glory; if the man is the immortal echo of God's word spoken, but the woman only the secondary echo of the primal echo, a reflection of a reflection:—who can call in question the divinely constituted superiority of the man to the woman? And if to cover the head and conceal the face is a ritual confession of that moral superiority, how dare the Corinthian women appear in the holy congregation *unveiled,* thereby asserting and proclaiming woman's equality with man?'

'Ἐξουσία here means, as elsewhere, permitted or assigned power, *authority;* see ch. ix. introductory note. There is no real difficulty in the use of the word in this text. Two things may be observed; first, the sign or veil is denoted by the name of the thing signified or authority: very common use this: compare "and bears his blushing *honours* thick upon him" and in Greek 'he wears *royalty*' (βασιλείαν, a diadem) = insignia of royalty. Secondly it should be noted that as all *authority* has for its correlative *subjection* and implies it and causes it as an effect, so the two correlatives sometimes pass over and change places, and the effect (subjection) is designated by the name of the cause (authority). The woman wears the veil as a badge of her subordination to man, and this veil is called conversely, what it also is, the sign of man's authority over woman. The second use is less common than the first. For the combination of the two uses in one word compare Macbeth, Act 3, Sc. 4.

"*Present him eminence both with eye and tongue,*"

i.e. offer him marks of homage, for signs of obeisance in you are signs of eminence in him: the two signs are correlative and connected like two opposite poles, the one abstract, the other concrete.

*because of the angels.*] The reason, specified in vv. 8 and 9, shewing *why* a women *ought* to wear upon the head the badge of man's God-given headship over woman, is now brought nearer home and made more vivid by the after-thought "because of the angels," i.e. from respect or regard for those unseen ministers of God and guardians of His order, who are present in the holy congregation, watching the behaviour of their human charge. If a woman be so lost to sense of shame that she shrinks not in church from the public eye, let her fear the mournful gaze of those divine sentinels. Or again, if she be so ambitious of equality with her superior, man, as to discard the veil of subordination, let her remember that she is watched by the order-loving angels, who themselves veil their faces before the face of God. The Greek Fathers often express their belief in the presence of angels in public worship: Chrysostom on this text: "Open the eyes of faith and thou shalt behold a theatre of spectators: for if the air is filled with angels, much more the church!" Again, "Knowest thou not that in the company of angels thou standest? With them thou singest, with them thou chantest, and yet dost thou stand there laughing?" St. Paul does not mean *evil* angels, as Tertullian: to escape the gaze of such angels as those who fell from God and from heaven 'ob concupiscentiam foeminarum:' for how could thickest veils afford an escape from the gaze of demons? If forms of spirits pass through walls of buildings, why should not eyes of spirits see through veils of women?

11. *Nevertheless*] Corrective caution: let

*power of her husband.* woman without the man, in the Lord.

12 For as the woman *is* of the man, even so *is* the man also by the woman; but all things of God.

13 Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?

14 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?

15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for *her* hair is given her for a [1]covering.

[1] Or, *veil.*

16 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

17 Now in this that I declare *unto you* I praise *you* not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse.

18 For first of all, when ye come

---

not the principal contemn the subordinate, nor a daughter of Eve undervalue her own position. The scales of the balance sometimes hang equal; and there are relations of life in which the woman stands level with the man. Though by creation the male is to the female as the sun to the moon, as the spirit to the soul, as the *animus* to the *anima*, yet in loving dependence on each other the two are one in their oneness with the Lord.

**12.** Reason for previous statement that the two sexes in domestic relations being mutually supplementary are in a sort of equipoise, and the women gets her compensation: *for just as the women is* **out of** *the man, so is the man also* **by means of** *the woman: all these* (relations) *however are of God.* That is, the woman has an equivalent in the divine order of nature, that, as man is the *initial* and the *final* cause of being to the woman, so woman is the *instrumental* cause of being to the man.

**13.** I appeal to each of you in his inner judgment: **beseeming is it that a woman offer up prayer to God unveiled?** Not as in A.V. *uncovered,* for a woman may cover her head and yet not conceal her face.

**14.** *Nature*=divine arrangement of things; here one of nature's laws that long hair is of the woman, short of the man; according to others it means 'inborn sense of propriety.' Argument: Is not the male sex, having short hair, *by nature unveiled,* and the female, having long hair, *by nature veiled?* If luxuriant tresses are a glory to a woman because they are *given* her as nature's veil, surely the textile fabric also, the moral badge of subordination, is equally becoming to her, inasmuch as it indicates her perception of harmony between what is physical and what is ethical in God's order of things.

**15.** Long hair is a glory to her, being nature's gift *to serve as* (ἀντί, is not, as Meyer, 'instead of' here) a circling mantle or veil floating about her (περιβόλαιον='a cast-around,' a textile envelope or hood.

**16.** Surely *this* verse, not the next, introduces a new topic, viz. the divisions in the Church and misconduct in the Agapae. Render, **Now if any one is minded to be contentious,** (let him know that) **we** (with the emphasis of authority) **do not allow of such practice** (contentiousness) **nor do the churches of God: now this** (our disallowance of contentiousness) **is an order that I give,** or **this I command** (from the Lord) **for I praise not your doings in coming together not for better but for worse.**

Here συνήθειαν means *practice,* Polyb. i. 42–7. The significant term *contentious* points backward in general to the dissensions and partisanship so rife in the Corinthian Church (i. 12) and points forward in particular to the confusions and disorders in the Love-feasts.

*We have no such custom.*] Rather *we* **admit of** or **entertain:** common use of ἔχω; compare Cicero, Res controversiam non *habet. The churches of God* with impressiveness. In the A.V. *I declare* (παραγγέλλω) cannot be right: see note on παραγγέλλω, ch. vii. 10. Render **for better** rather than *for the better,* as in A.V.

**18.** *For first of all.*] He censures two kinds of evil attaching to their assemblies, deterioration in the Agapae or love-feasts and misapplication of the gifts of the Spirit. The second mischief is introduced in xii. 1. The particle μέν here either misses altogether its partner δέ or finds it at last in xii. 1. (It should be noted that the participle συνερχομένων is in the *imperf. tense* and rather means '*as* ye come together.' The article τῇ also should be away. 'That there *be* divisions' cannot be right in the A.V. for ὑπάρχειν=*are the rule, are constitutional:* see notes xi. 7 and vii. 26.)

Render, **I hear that in your coming together in assembly** (to form a meeting) **divisions among you are the rule, and to some degree I believe it:** i.e. not of all nor of most do I think this true, but of an indefinite some or few. St. Paul describes his *belief to a certain point* as apply-

Digitized by Google

together in the church, I hear that there be [1]divisions among you; and I partly believe it.

[1] Or, *schisms.*

19 For there must be also [1]heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.

[1] Or, *sects.*

20 When ye come together therefore into one place, [1]*this* is not to eat the Lord's supper.

[1] Or, *ye cannot eat.*

21 For in eating every one taketh before *other* his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken.

22 What? have ye not houses to

---

ing only to a charitably supposed minority of disorderlies: excipit innocentes et miti sermone utitur (Bengel). The word *divisions* in this text does not mean *schisms*, as in the margin of the A.V. The Greek *schismata* may be literally rendered by our word **splits** in the modern sense, as 'splits in the cabinet,' marked dissensions threatening disruption. It should be remembered that this Epistle says nothing of separation into sects, but speaks of partition into schools, as Pauline, Apolloite, Petrine, Christine; see Introduction to Epistle: it describes an arrogant party-spirit tending indeed to a breach of outward unity, but not yet sundering the bond.

**19.** *For there must be also heresies.*] *Must* denotes a *necessity* growing out of the divine order and government. Not *heresies* in the sense of 'false doctrines' nor *sects* as in the margin of the A.V. The word in Greek means 'self-chosen views' differing from received opinions. (The καὶ here is not climactic for αἱρέσεις is not stronger than σχίσματα, but simply *accumulative*). *They which are approved;* metaphor from assaying metals, see end of ch. ix. *May be made manifest:* rather '**may become** *so*,' **may come to light.** The sense is in full: 'there must needs be self-assertions and headstrong opinions as well as divisions, as a means of testing, **in order that the approved may come to view amongst you** and the genuine be sifted from the spurious, the true metal from the base alloy, the gold from the ore.

**20.** *therefore.*] i.e. because of the splits and divisions that are rife amongst you, **coming together as you do** (i.e. *in the way you do*) **for the same object** (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό) of celebrating a Love-feast and with it or after it the Holy Communion, **it is not possible to eat a supper meet for the Lord**: more literally, *there is no eating a Lord's Supper.* Full sense: Seeing you do not tarry for one another (ver. 33), but come disorderly in straggling fashion, instead of waiting for the whole congregation to arrive and *then* keeping the feast in concert and eating all collectively of the one bread and drinking all collectively of the one cup—when this is the *manner* in which you meet, how is it within the compass of such irregularities to eat a meal that shall properly culminate in the Supper of the Lord? It is out of the question: *non est*, οὐκ ἔστιν: 'there's no such thing.' The whole assembly should first meet as one body, and then celebrate the social and the heavenly banquet: as things now are, instead of the company combining (so to speak) into a continent, every man is an island and the straggling totality an archipelago.

*into one place.*] A.V. Rather in *moral* sense than local, 'bent *upon* the same thing' (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό), '*for one* object.' The phrase elsewhere has a local sense, but not so in Acts ii. 1, where ὁμοῦ means 'in the same *place*,' and ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό seems to mean 'for the same purpose:' so Acts ii. 44, and iii. 1, and Psalm ii. 1, LXX.

The Agapé was a social feast combined in some way with the Eucharist. If in the Apostolic age it was the prologue to the Holy Communion, it afterwards became the epilogue. Chrysostom, *in hoc loco* throws light: "The first Christians had all things in common: this custom ceasing, as it did in the time of the Apostles, there came into its room a sort of offshoot or efflux of it. For though the wealthy no longer deposited their goods in a common fund, nevertheless on stated days they kept an open table for the Agapé. After divine service and the communion of the mysteries the rich and the poor together feasted in kindly fellowship." (Hom. 27.) An interesting passage bearing upon this custom is found in Augustine, Epist cxviii. ad Januar. cc. 6, 7. Placuit Spiritui Sancto ut in honorem tanti sacramenti in os Christiani prius Dominicum corpus intraret quam exteri cibi . . . .

**21.** Connection: if your manner of assembling for the same professed object is what I hear it is, feast you may in tumultuous fashion, but eat a Lord's supper, one meet for Him, ye cannot; **for one by one** (instead of each *taking* equally *with* the rest of the common Supper) **foretakes** (takes before the rest) **his own singular supper in the course of the meal!** i.e. *during* the repast (the aor. φαγεῖν = eating begun, continued and ended: not *every one* as in A. V.: ἕκαστος = *one by one*, first A and then B and C, each singly).

*and one is hungry, and another is drunken.*] This rendering of the A. V. just misses the



Digitized by Google

eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame [1]them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise *you* not.

[1] Or, *them that are poor?*

23 For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the *same* night in which he was betrayed took bread:

24 [a]And when he had given

[a] Matt. 26. 26. Mark 14. 22. Luke 22. 19.

---

point of the argument: which is that the evil of the disorder consists not merely in the two contrasted states of hunger and surfeit, but also in their *simultaneousness* and *coincidence*, a fact utterly subversive of the true idea of an Agapé, which is that rich and poor should share alike and feast together in brotherly charity. Render, **and so while one is hungry, another is drunken.** For the particles μέν and δέ indicate two different states belonging to one and the same time common to both.

**22.** Connection: what an abuse of fellowship, what a mockery of charity; when in this ἔρανος, or hallowed repast of free contributions, the poor man fasts till he is famished, the rich man feasts till he is drunken! Face to face Hunger with Revel! And this in the holy congregation! I am amazed: one of two alternatives: either ye, who surfeit in church, have no houses to feast in or if ye have the lesser ye despise the greater: but houses ye have, don't say (μή) ye have not: therefore ye despise the church — of God. Render, **Why really, houses have ye none for eating and drinking? Or** (the other horn of the dilemma) **the church of God** (the stateliness of the articles should be noted and the emphasis of dignity on the word *God*) **despise ye, and put to shame** (by your unblushing exhibition of selfish excess) **such as have nought? What must I say to you? Give you praise** (aorist) **herein? Praise I do not.**

**23.** Quite the reverse: *I blame* conduct so much at variance with certain instructions, that were by Christ Himself committed to *me* and by me transmitted to *you*, **for I received of the Lord what I delivered also unto you.** Here *of* means *straight* **from**; (ἀπό not παρά; Meyer quite wrong here) by *revelation direct*, whether in ecstatic or other form we know not. Most solemn and stately in its grandeur of simplicity is "this oldest account of the Lord's Supper" (Meyer), "this authentic narrative given by the risen Christ" (Olshausen): how calculated to shock into sobriety the frivolity of the Corinthian Agapae!

*was betrayed.*] Rather **in the night that he was delivered**: the same word as in the sentence preceding. Moreover παραδιδόναι never seems to mean *betray*. God, willing to deliver man from Satan's power into His own keeping, as a means thereunto first *delivered* (παρεδίδου, Rom. ix. 32) Christ into man's power, who crucified Him. *Judas* also *delivered* Christ to the authorities and was therefore called ὁ παραδιδούς (Mark xiv. 42), but because he did so *with treachery and for a price*, he was also called *traitor*, προδότης (Luke vi. 16.) The essential sense of our word *deliver* is to *release from*: whether I release from my own keeping into another's, and so hand over or transfer (as a postman *delivers* a letter or a preacher a sermon) or whether I release from another's power into my own keeping and so emancipate, is a thing determined by circumstances: the essential sense is unaltered: I *deliver* in either case.

The verb in the imperfect tense: *atmospheric* imperf. for the shadow of the coming event was even now felt. A deed has its commencement within the mind, its completion outside; and the *threefold delivery*, God's surrender of His Son and Christ's surrender of Himself and Judas's betrayal of his Master, had already *set in*.

**24.** *took bread.*] A cake of bread lying on the table. *Given thanks*, i.e. for εὖ or God's *good gifts* of bread and wine: the idea of *thanks* is exhausted in the χάρις. N.B. So in εὐλογεῖν 'to bless' or 'consecrate' the Word speaks the word εὖ, and εὖ *becomes* when it becomes: no doubt this is the inner sense. In these several compounds εὖ always indicates God's good gifts to man, whether in *evangel* or tidings of *good* or in the text, "This is my beloved son in whom I purposed *for good*, i.e. for man's salvation: εὐδοκία = ἡ ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ βούλησις (Oecumenius).

*Take, eat.*] These words should be omitted: they occur in St. Luke xxii.

*this is my body.*] The much controverted *is* means precisely *is*. It can never mean, as many, *signifies* or *represents*, nor can it combine, as some, both senses *is* and *signifies*. It is the *copula* pure and simple, the link of correlation between the subject *this* and the predicate *my body*. In general this correlation is one of identity, but identity of what kind or *to what degree* lies not in the copula to determine but solely in the context, i.e. in the character of the surroundings and also in the nature of the case. In the text 'I am the vine' the *am* is *am* simply, and the 'vine' is vine in a mental figure. In this phrase 'I am the vine' the identity between subject

Digitized by Google

thanks, he brake *it*, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do [1]in remembrance of me.

25 After the same manner also *he took* the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft

[1] Or, *for a remembrance.*

---

and predicate is *limited* to certain properties of mutual immanence and consequent fruitfulness which are absolutely common to Christ himself who is seen with the eye of the body and to the natural vine as contemplated with the mind's eye. So in Gal. iv. 24, 'These women are the two covenants,' i.e. are, *in so far as* freedom and bondage are states absolutely common to the women and the covenants. For one thing may not improperly be said to be another within the precise limits of certain qualities or properties common to both. It may be added that our Lord at the Institution, speaking in Aramaic, would omit the copula, but when He made His revelation to St. Paul, speaking probably in Greek, He would insert it. So far for the sense of *is*. But the sentence *This is my body* has really no analogy whatsoever to the text *I am the vine* or *These are the covenants*, as many assert: this is evident from the nature of the case: it clearly belongs to that class of passages in which the copula links together subject and predicate not merely as identical more or less, but chiefly as correlated in the way of *cause* and *effect*. Such passages are numerous in St. Paul: one may suffice from Rom. viii. 10, *the Spirit is life*, i.e. the principle of life, as cause, is energy or activity of life as effect. Similarly in the text before us, there is no identity indeed, but there is a certain *congruity* between God's lesser *good* (εὖ) or gift of bread and God's inestimable *good* (εὖ) or gift of the Body, given by Him and self-given by Christ; for from the earthborn food comes natural nourishment, from the heavenly spiritual; and there is besides this congruity a correlation also of *cause* and *effect*. So that the meaning seems to be: This (in effect) is my body: *how* such instrumental cause produces such effect, is to us unknown: but, as Hooker says, 'That which produceth any certain effect is not improperly *said to be* that very effect whereunto it tendeth,' and this usage in language is far from uncommon. One instance in Vergil, the archer in battle "levels *wounds*" at the foe; volnera derigit: the arrow is called by the name of its effect. In this very chapter, *v.* 29, we find a similar usage in a construction where the immaterial copula *is* does not occur: *he eateth judgment*: clearly the natural bread that the man eats is not judgment in itself, is not sickness or death in itself, but *a* cause of judgment: the irreverent communicant eats in the consecrated bread what is in effect judgment. In the Lord's Supper the bread taken and eaten is in the mystical effects thereof the Body really received, not 'partaken of,' but as Augustine says corpus *acceptum*. This interpretation seems to be supported by the neuter τοῦτο: for the subject being in gender attracted to the predicate tends to shew a corresponsive affinity between the bread taken and eaten and the Body received (in St. Luke's account *Take, eat* immediately precedes *This is*). For if our Lord had intended to give a definition purely objective, meaning *This bread as it is*, most probably οὗτος would have been used, not τοῦτο: this appears from the fact that in Greek, as well as in Latin, generally speaking, the demonstrative or the relative pronoun, when it is used to define objectively, is attracted in gender not to the predicate of its own clause but to its own antecedent in the previous: see Coloss. 1, 24. For the usage in this text comp. Livy, *eam* (= boves) *avertere praedam*, *the booty* being the effect of *cattle carried off*. (See Acts ii. 16, τοῦτό ἐστι and Acts viii. 10, οὗτός ἐστιν.) The dogma of transubstantiation is a baseless fabric, apparently founded in part upon ignorance of linguistic usage.

*for you.*] In your behalf: ὑπέρ properly denotes the moral attitude of a soul bending in solicitude *over* some one: comp. Vergil, 'Multa *super* Priamo rogitans.' It never *per se* = ἀντί: the true idea of substitution lies in the word ἀντίλυτρον. The word *broken* should be omitted: "this is my *body*, the for you"—if any copula other than ὄν is to be supplied, rather διδόμενον, than with Meyer κλώμενον.

25. *when he had supped.*] Rather, **supper being done.**

*This cup is the new testament.*] The contents of the cup are identified with their continent, shewing that the *oneness* of the cup has a correlation to the *whole* of the contents: no isolation. The copula *is* here, as in v. 24 and elsewhere, means neither *represents* nor *symbolises*, but simply *is*.

*in my blood.*] Emphasis here on the *my*, with a tacit reference to the typical 'blood of bulls and of goats.' An emphasis should be placed on the word *new* also: this from its position. Full sense: 'this cup is the instrument of the *new* covenant, i.e. of its consecration in *my* blood.' In St. Luke xxii. 20 (where the immaterial *is* in the Greek is not) we have the same truth in the same form, save that there it is 'in my *blood*,' not 'in *my* blood' as here: but in Matthew and in Mark

Digitized by Google

as ye drink *it*, in remembrance of me.

26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, [1]ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.

27 Wherefore whosoever shall eat

[1] Or, *shew ye*.

---

we find the same truth in another form, 'This (cup in the effects of its whole contents drunk) is my *blood* of the covenant;' the construction being precisely the same as in the sentence, *This* (bread eaten) in its effects *is my body*. But when in ch. x. 16 we read that the *bread broken is the communion* (personal), we must supply mentally 'the *medium* of.' All these underlinks of logical connexion are, for the sake of brevity, so often omitted in uttered speech that they are at the time of speaking unconsciously supplied in the mind; but in the interpretation of written language it is sometimes not easy to trace these underlinks: the difficulty is to *catch the colour of the context*.

*testament in my blood.*] Double antitype, the *new* in *my own:* the new covenant, not of the *law written* (γράμματος, 2 Cor. iii. 6) but of the Spirit writing in the heart, established for ever in the one Blood. This Blood is (1) outpoured (the ἐκχυννόμενον, of Luke xxii. 20, is for us the aor. ἐκχυθέν) on the cross for atonement (2) given back from heaven with vivifying powers in the Eucharist. For in the great sacrifice, never to be repeated, it was *outpoured once* for the potential remission of all the sins of all mankind; in the sacraments it is *applied often* that the potential remission may become actual, for (as the learned Dean Jackson says) 'no sins are actually *remitted* before they are actually *committed*.' These features in the antitype will stand out clearer, if it be borne in mind that in the typical covenant-sacrifice there were two parties to the divine arrangement, God and man (Israel): the outpoured blood of the victim was therefore divided into two halves, one for scattering (Keil on Pentat.) on the altar with a view to reconciliation, the other, as given back from the altar, for sprinkling on the people with a view to cleansing or purification. The blood, thus divided, was regarded as one blood in itself, two in its uses. In close harmony with these typical facts is the admirable comment of Chrysostom, who makes our Lord say, "I have become a possessor with you (μέτοχος) of flesh and blood for your sakes: again that flesh and blood, by which I have become akin to you, I *give back* to you." Clearly the sacramental *Communion* is the sequel and the effect of the sacrificial Covenant: διαθήκη potentiates κοινωνία.

N.B. The word διαθήκη in Israelite usage means *covenant*, in Hellenic *testament:* the Greek word for covenant is συνθήκη. The under-lying sense common to both uses is *arrangement* or *settlement:* this and nothing more: e.g. διαθέσθαι ἔριν (Xen.) 'to *arrange* a quarrel.' With which of the two circumstantial senses 'covenant' or 'testament' the essential sense chooses to clothe itself, the context alone determines. It is curious that in this passage of St. Paul διαθήκη wears the meaning of *covenant* in the presence of the *blood*, of *testament* in prospect of the *death* (v. 26). No one word in English combines the two meanings. The 'blood of the covenant' and the 'death of the testator' are phrases well-known from Ep. Hebr.

It is called *God's* covenant because *He* makes the whole arrangement, of His free grace bestowing on man not only the inheritance attached to the covenant on stated conditions, but also spiritual gifts whereby man fulfilling the conditions may be made meet for the inheritance. On these grounds, perhaps, the A.V. rendering of *testament* is better than *covenant*, which rather implies some equality in the two parties to the arrangement: see Hebr. ix. 16.

*this do ye.*] The analogue of the Paschal *we will do* (ποιήσομεν) in Exod. xxiv. 7: "The people answered, all the words which the LORD hath said *will we do*. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled on the people and said, *Behold the blood of the covenant*." After the scattering of the blood on the altar and before sprinkling it on the people the answer was given, 'We will do.'

*in remembrance of me.*] Rather '*for the* remembrance.' When the typical Passover was instituted, "the LORD said unto Moses and Aaron, This day shall be unto you *for a memorial*, and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord *throughout your generations*:" these last words correspond to the words *until the Lord come* in the antitypical Institution of the Eucharist. As conditions were annexed to the Mosaic covenant, so to the Christian in the words of our Lord, *This do ye* as oft as ye thus eat and drink; do what I have done, first give thanks for *good* (εὖ) and speak the word of *good* (εὖ), that God's earthborn gifts of the bread and wine offered by you may in their use become to you His heavenly food of the blessed Body and Blood.

**26.** Connexion: "this do for the remembrance of *me*, *for* as often as." . . . *This bread:* τοῦτον, not in demonstrative sense, but in predicative, "the bread of the future *thus consecrated:*" comp. Verg. *ea* fama vagatur, 'a rumour to that effect.'

Digitized by Google

this bread, and drink *this* cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

28 But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of *that* bread, and drink of *that* cup.

29 For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh

---

*ye do shew.*] Present imperfect: action continuing into the future: ye do *proclaim down* the centuries as they roll to their terminus the Advent: The Lord's death ye thus declare onwards until the day of His coming, when the kingdom long ago bequeathed (Luke xxii. 29) shall be bestowed and the Inheritance long ago released by the death of the Testator (Hebr. ix. 16) shall become a possession for ever, and the *Testator* Himself shall appear as *Executor.* "The Lord's death" has other correlations besides that of His Father's kingdom 'in which the fruit of the vine shall be drunk *new*:' see Col. i. 22; Rom. v. 10. In the clause *till he come,* the absence of the ἄν denotes in St. Paul's mind the absolute certainty of the Coming despite the uncertainty of the time.

**27.** *Wherefore.*] Inference of St. Paul from the words of the institution revealed to him by Christ Himself. The stateliness of the six articles in the Greek draws attention to this solemn declaration. *Or drink:* the *or* gives no countenance to 'communion under one kind;' for though the particle is disjunctive it does not tend to put asunder the bread and the cup: and even if it did, it would just as easily allow the cup without the bread to be taken as the bread without the cup: so Bengel. The word *unworthily,* as the general context (*vv.* 19–21) clearly shews, points to irreverence of *manner,* which of itself argues unmeetness of spirit. The *or* is, in fact, preferable to *and,* as in the prevailing disorderliness of the neophyte Church in Corinth this or that dissembler would take the bread reverently and the cup irreverently, or vice versâ. Formal unseemliness in eating *or* drinking implies moral unworthiness in the eater and drinker. The meaning then is, if a man eat or drink unworthily, he is liable to judgment (what kind of judgment, see *v.* 29) for contempt "of the body and the blood of the Lord." (Here ἔνοχος = under guilt or obligation to punishment, 'in-hold' or 'in-bond' to. . . .)

**28.** Emphasis on *examine:* metaphor from metal-testing: let him approve himself, sifting what is refuse from what is sterling, the carnal from the spiritual. *And so*—after such examination—*let him eat*—the grammatical structure now changes—no longer 'this bread' 'but '*of* the bread,' the *of* (ἐκ) by position emphatic, seeming to denote, precisely as in ch. x. 17 (see note there) the mystical *effects* of the bread eaten. These mystical effects then are the veritable Flesh of the glorified Body, that living Bread from heaven which is the Flesh of Christ (Joh. vi. 51), of which heavenly Bread the earthly bread is to the faithful receiver *in esu et usu* the material cause. This divine flesh, spiritually eaten, assimilates us to its own spiritual substance, just as on the other hand we assimilate to our bodily substance the material bread physically eaten: to this effect Augustine, Hic panis sacer *comestus* non mutatur in nostram substantiam sed nos potius in se transmutat sibique unit et similes facit, quod non facit panis communis. The same Latin Father adds *Crede et manducasti;* true, for as *in the heart* the regenerate man is circumcised without hand, as with *the eyes of the heart* also the enlightened man sees (Ephes. i. 18), so with "the mouth of the spirit" the 'inner man of the new creation' eats that Bread from Heaven which is the Flesh of Christ. This text compared with *vv.* 26, 27 seems to shew (1) that unworthy communicants and worthy alike 'declare the Lord's death;' (2) that he who has eaten the sacramental bread without appropriating the blessed effects thereof is not *after* eating the bread that which he was *before,* let alone his liability to corrective judgments in the shape of bodily sufferings for non-discernment of the divine human Body. For the deeper teachings of these important verses see Note at the end of the chapter.

**29.** *Unworthily* in this verse should be omitted. Render, **for the eater and drinker** (who beyond eating and drinking has no ulterior view to the sacramental gifts, who eats τὸν ἄρτον, not ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου as well) **eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body.** *Damnation* of the A. V. is wrong. Bentley and others make the clause *not discerning,* &c., to be not a modal definition of the subject, but a conditioning clause = *if he do not discern* or *appreciate:* but does not this construction belong rather to Attic usage than to Hellenistic or Pauline?

The verb διακρίνειν = to find the right and true by searching between two objects having some points of resemblance in common: *dijudicare* verum et fictum amorem (Cic.) Here it means to reach the essence by sifting from it the accidents, to discern the spiritual substance beyond the natural circumstance, to find and appreciate the *noumenon* of the Body, discriminating it from the *phænomenon* of the

Digitized by Google

1 Or, *judgment.* [1]damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

30 For this cause many *are* weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.

31 For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

32 But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.

33 Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another.

34 And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto [1]condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come. 1 Or, *judgment.*

---

bread. In these verses the A. V. renderings are not happy: it should be noted that *crima* means 'judgment' temporal, such as "divers diseases and sundry kinds of death": these judgments are intended to be corrective and remedial in this life, lest a worse thing in the next befall the frivolous communicant: that worse thing is *catacrîma* or final judgment to death eternal, *damnation*, the fearful but necessary alternative of ineffectual *crimata*. The assonance of these several cognate words, the recurring ring of the common *cri*, is not easy to reproduce in English.

**30.** *many sleep.*] Rather, **fall asleep not a few.** *Weak and sickly*, physically and perhaps morally.

**31.** Connexion from *v.* 29: *not spiritually discerning the Body*, and on that account liable to bodily afflictions, which we might escape by duly searching our hearts beforehand, *for if our own selves we morally discerned, we should not be judged.* There are two discernings, the one leading to the other, (1) of the inner man receiving, (2) of the inner gifts received: how can these last be appropriated unless there be a corresponsive appropriativeness, such as the expectancy of faith and surrender of the will unto receptivity of spirit—all fruits of moral sifting? If this duty be practised, the fructifying seed of sacramental grace will fall no longer on rocky stubbornness or fallow indifference, but on the honest heart of diligent preparation well exercised with the moral ploughshare of self-examination. It is scarcely possible to imagine a more inaccurate rendering of this important ver. than the following:—"If we had judged (διεκρίνομεν) ourselves, these judgments would not have fallen upon us from God (οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα)."

*if we would judge ourselves.*] A. V. is not right here, nor yet Alford in loco, nor yet the rendering in hints 'on a Fresh Revision' p. 66, "If we *had discerned* ourselves we should not *have been judged;*" for the Imperf. Indic. plainly shews that the corrective visitations are not passed away, but still proceeding: comp. John v. 46, *For if ye* (now) *believed Moses, ye would* (now) *believe me:* where the A. V. is less right than it is in this verse. Clear as day is the teaching of these texts: the judgments which the solemn trifler 'eateth and drinketh to himself,' are not punishments but rather chastisements, sent in mercy to work in him true repentance and receptivity meet.

Perhaps the sevenfold *cri* of the Greek may be represented in the sevenfold *judg* of the following retranslation: **For the eater and drinker eateth and drinketh a judgment to himself, not rightly judging the Body. For this cause among you are many weaklings and invalids, and there fall asleep not a few. For if our own selves we did but rightly judge, we should not be judged: being judged, however, we are by the Lord being disciplined, that we may not with the world be judged to death. Wherefore, my brethren, in coming together to eat, tarry one for another.**

**32.** *condemned with the world.*] Not the judgment of the church at the Advent, but the final judgment of the world, to which careless Christians are in danger of being relegated: see ch. vi. and ix. at end: many *crimata* far better than the one irreversible *catacrima.*

**33.** *when ye come.*] Rather '*as* ye come' or *in coming together.* See notes on *vv.* 18, 20.

**34.** *that ye come not together unto condemnation.*] Rather **may not**: final, not definitive use of *that. Unto condemnation:* render, **for a judgment;** '*to get* a bodily affliction.' *When I come;* rather, **according as I come:** the presence of the ἂν points to uncertainty of the time and of the event: for this use comp. Æsch. Eum. μαντεύομαι γὰρ ὡς ἂν ἡγῆται θεός.

Digitized by Google

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 4, 28.

**4.** Some eminent scholars—Estius, Bengel, Neander—take the other view of the *natural* head. But, it may be objected, if St. Paul had meant to describe the man's physical head, he would probably have omitted *αὐτοῦ* or *his* after *τὴν κεφαλήν*: compare ver. 10, where *αὐτῆς* or *her* is under similar circumstances omitted. In fact instead of using the more ordinary phrase *κατακάλυμμα ἔχων* the Apostle *prefers* the more homely and graphic and somewhat contemptuous phrase 'wearing (drapery) from head,' intending *more suo* with a touch of sarcasm to point an epigrammatic antithesis between the two heads. See on this frequent manner of his ch. viii. Introduction, and ver. 10: and vi. 12.

A third view, that strives to combine both the literal and metaphorical senses into a single double, is one that tends to mar simplicity of interpretation. It is, that "the physical head of the man is to be regarded as the representative of his spiritual Head;" quoted by Alford. This compromise serves rather to confuse: one sense at a time is enough for one word. Is it not a strange idea also, that a *man's head*, whether representative or not, should be *put to shame?*

**28.** A brief abstract upon the subject of this verse may be inserted here, from Bibl. Psych. p. 411, E.T.: "There is no such thing as a saving effect of the sacraments that occurs *ex opere operato*, that is not conditioned upon faith. Without faith there is attained *no reflex possession* of the sacramental gifts. But even in the case where the faith of the receiver does not respond to the sacraments, they remain in their substance and power, what they are in themselves by virtue of the immutable will of God, which is linked to no human condition. He who is baptized, even if he have not received baptism in a right mental comprehension, needs not to be baptized again: the substantial contents of the sacrament have in him a living presence once for all. Let him by faith allow this presence to realize itself in a reflex manner in him to his salvation, which (salvation) he already has nigh to his inward self *actu directo*. And he who does not receive the Lord's Supper in true faith, still receives Christ's body and blood, and the sacramental gifts are in him, in the hope that he may allow them to redound to salvation as disciplining powers (1 Cor. xi. 29–32). They are brought into immediate nearness to the man: they are appropriated to him by God, in order that he may appropriate them to himself by means of faith." To which may be added; as in the sphere of divine grace, so is it in God's world of nature: in the case of a blind man, the eye is in the light, but no light in the eye: the light is near and around him, seeking admittance, and so he is not in darkness; darkness is in himself: yet he is in a better position than if the darkness were double: for then, even if his blindness were healed, he could 'never see light.'

---

## THE CHARISMATA, OR EXTRAORDINARY GIFTS OF GRACE IN CONNECTION WITH CHAPTERS XII. AND XIV.

THE first divine impulse, which in the form of *charismata* or miraculous grace-gifts was communicated to the new creation of the Christian Church, was destined in the course of two or three centuries to subside by degrees into the quiet pulses and more regular life of a growing organism. The infancy of Christianity from the day of Pentecost was, in all who yielded themselves to the divine influence, emphatically marked by depth of purpose and power of action and in particular by extraordinary experiences of mystical raptures manifested in the threefold ecstasy, mystic, prophetic, glossolalic. This marvellous light shone all the brighter from its marked contrast with the marginal darkness of the heathen world that environed the luminous centre. This initial outpouring of miraculous endowments seems to have settled down slowly within more defined limits into a calm current of spiritual graces and of acquired knowledge. As regards the singular manifestations recorded in these chapters, the following remarks may help to clear away some of the *haze* (*ἀσάφειαν*, Chrysostom in loco) which to us moderns, owing to our lack of experimental knowledge, continues to veil these mysteries of the Apostolic ecstasies.

That which in man thinks and wills and experiences is called in general *πνεῦμα*, or spirit. This noblest and innermost region of human nature is self-

Digitized by Google

conscious, and appears to be tripartite. For Gregory of Nyssa makes πνεῦμα and νοῦς and λόγος constituents or factors of a human trinity in the human spirit. Thus there will be a spirit within spirit, a special within the general, something like a citadel in a city or a keep in a castle or a shrine in a temple: indeed, Bengel calls it *penetrale*. This culminating point seems to be the quintessence of man's spirit-nature: it is the meeting-place between God condescending and man apprehending; the central point of contact and of communion between the divine Spirit and the human, which are two substantially kindred natures, for *spiritus humanus et substantia et efficientia simillimus divino est*. This eminent nature, towering above the *noûs* and the *logos* and yet in constant communication with both, excepting cases of ecstatic glossolalia, is the serene region of immediate experience of the divine love and also of immediate intuition into divine mysteries. All three, *nous* and *logos* and *pneuma*, are in their nature consubstantial, i. e. of one spiritual contexture; and thus all three together make up the human spirit, regarded as one division in the human trichotomy (1 Thess. v. 23).

From this special constituent *pneuma* of the general spirit-nature in man we now come to the other constituents, the *noûs* and the *logos*. That by which a man thinks and determines himself is called νοῦς or γνοῦς, etymon, Sanscrit root *gnâ* = spiritual perception, Lat. *gnavus*. It is the thinking and willing faculty, flexible to the σάρξ in the natural man, flexible to the πνεῦμα in the spiritual man: swayed by the flesh, it is called νοῦς τῆς σαρκός (Col. ii. 18); controlled by the spirit, it is termed νοῦς τοῦ πνεύματος or *mens animi*, which of course is to be distinguished from the above-described πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός or "shrine of the temple" = *spiritus* or *animus mentis*. This distinction is necessary to a clearer apprehension of ch. xiv. It appears then that the believing *noûs* or capacity of reflexive thought is a spiritual or rational faculty, directed heavenward to the ultimate root and essence of things, ever striving through and beyond God's visible *phænomena* to discern His unseen *noöumena*. The product of this *noûs* is *logos*, the speech or word of a personal nature; for it should be borne in mind that the human spirit, regarded as a constituent of the trichotomy, is endowed with self-consciousness: it is spirit capable of speech. Accordingly, *noûs* is to *logos* as *thought speaking* to *thought spoken* or *word*, even as a silent well-spring to a babbling brook (Philo) or as Moses to Aaron (Philo). Wherefore speech is the capacity, the efficiency, the embodiment or investiture of thought, out of which, as out of cognate stuff, it is woven, for the two are the same nature in different stages of quiescence or of advancement; both are essentially identical, inasmuch as *thought* is *inward speaking* and *speech* is *thinking aloud*. To this effect Eusebius on Ps. lvi. 5. "Our speech (*logos*), which has its substance in syllables and words and names and is uttered by means of tongue and voice, is not properly to be called speech; for it has a producer in another, the inward speech: this is the true *logos*." This last quotation and the general substance of the above remarks are borrowed from Bibl. Psych. iv. Sect. V.

It may help to elucidate one or two texts in these chapters if it be borne in mind that this triplicity of specialties in the one nature of the human spirit is, or seems to be, the created image of the Eternal archetype in the Tripersonal Godhead: wherein the Father, if He may be designated analogously to the Word, is the absolute Νοῦς, while the Son, as the Λόγος, is "the one eternal self-thought of God (ἐννόημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, Clem. Alex.), the Thought of His whole proper nature, made objective and personal in the Word of God. This everlasting Word is Himself the divine Archetype of the human *logos*, of the thought of Ego, whereby man becomes objective to himself as a person." Does not this hidden truth unconsciously transpire to us in such familiar phrases as 'Said I to myself, and myself said again unto me'?

As therefore in the Spirit-nature of the Godhead there is personally distinguished the Holy Ghost, so within the

Digitized by Google

spirit-nature of man, or *pneuma* in comprehensive sense, stands out the culminating spirit or *pneuma* in concentrated sense. There is a beautiful passage in Claudian Mamercus de Statu Animæ, i. 26, apposite to this subject, only let *spirit-nature* be substituted for the word *soul;* Ego et Pater, saith the Lord to the soul, et Caritas nostra unus Deus sumus; tu mens rationalis et verbum et dilectio tua unus es homo, ad similitudinem auctoris tui factus, non ad æqualitatem, creatus nempe, non genitus. Recede ab his quæ infra te sunt, minus formosa quam tu es: accede formatrici formæ, quo possis esse formosior. From the above passage it appears that the pure and concentrated spirit of man's spirit-nature is the meeting-place of God and man; of God lavishing gifts of love and instilling that peace which passeth all *noûs*, and of man receiving and adoring: in fact, the divine *Caritas*, filling the human *dilectio* (which *dilectio* is a capacity of the *Caritas* and by nature akin thereunto), like mighty sunshine filling common daylight. It should be noted moreover that the greater *attracts* the lesser, the divine the human, and sometimes, as in the ecstasy, absorbs and transports even: for there is an affinity of essence between the two, even as between a magnet of steel attracting and a bar of iron attracted; or, as in the production of the electric light, between the two carbonic poles, positive and negative, the positive ready to communicate the current, the negative apt to receive the same; but these illustrations are not to be pushed beyond their terrene limits.

This idea that it is the inmost spirit of man's spirit-nature which comes into immediate contact and ineffable communion with the Holy Spirit, will serve to account for the order of sequence which in the cardinal texts of ch. xii. 4, 5, 6, St. Paul assigns to the three Divine Persons, the order namely of an ascending climax, beginning with the Holy Ghost. This idea may also tend to throw some light into the recesses of the two ecstasies of prophesying and of uttering with tongues; for that which is common to both these divine raptures is consciousness exalted above the human sphere, yet consciousness at the same time exercised in man's what may be termed *shrinal* spirit. In this *penetrale*, possessed in the ecstasy by the divine influence, experience or tasting of heavenly mysteries seems to precede intuition or comprehension, even as Bernhard well observes, "Nisi gustaveris, non videbis: manna absconditum est, nomen novum est quod nemo scit nisi qui accipit. Non illud eruditio sed unctio docet, non scientia sed conscientia comprehendit." It may here be remarked, in reference to ch. xiv., that in the *glossolalia* communications between a man's higher *pneuma* and his *noûs*, or between the 'citadel and the city,' are during the ecstasy *interrupted* and *suspended;* in the prophetic utterance they are maintained without interruption.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

*1 Spiritual gifts 4 are divers, 7 yet all to profit withal. 8 And to that end are diversely bestowed: 12 that by the like proportion, as the members of a natural body tend all to the 16 mutual decency, 22 service, and 26 succour of the same body; 27 so we should do one for another, to make up the mystical body of Christ.*

NOW concerning spiritual *gifts*, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.

---

CHAP. XII. 1. *concerning the Spirit's gifts.*] Brief summary: the general distinctive feature of speaking in the Spirit is the confession of Jesus as the Lord, but the special utterances of the Spirit, vouchsafed to individuals for the welfare of the community, differ from one another. One and the same Spirit is the supreme source of these varied endowments, just as in the natural world a single water is the higher source of innumerable irrigations. From ver. 12 onwards the unity of the Spirit expressed in a variety of grace-gifts is illustrated by the unity of the human body, which consists of a

Digitized by Google

2 Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led.

3 Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus [1]accursed: and *that* no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.

[1] Or, *anathema.*

4 Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.

5 And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord.

6 And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

7 But the manifestation of the

---

multiplicity of members in harmonious combination. From the reciprocal service rendered by all the members to each other, not one of which is out of place or without its proper use, an inference is to be drawn that, as Christians are constituents of a spiritual organism, none of them should depreciate either himself or any of his fellows; even the need and worth of such as are endowed with fewer or inferior gifts should be fully recognised. Still there ought to be a striving after the more excellent *charismata*, and the Apostle (ver. 31) will show the Corinthians the way thereunto. In this verse τῶν πνευματικῶν is clearly *neuter*, not (as many) masculine.

**2.** Render, **Ye know that when ye were heathen, as haply ye were led, ye were led away to worship those idols so speechless:** those mute images which, so far from inspiring speech, were not able to speak themselves! No doubt, in St. Paul's mind the *leading* power here is Satan, who behind the old-world machinery of idolatry and of oracles was by the ministries of his delusive demons the wily wirepuller of moral mischief: ch. x. 20. In this verse the result of being *drawn* at all is the being *drawn away:* attraction becomes absorption. The opposite to this leading astray is expressed in Rom. viii. 14. (The ὡς ἂν = *as on occasions.* The Greek parallels quoted by Alford are no parallels at all, because in them the ἂν occurs in the *apodosis;* here it occurs in the *protasis:* in fact here ἂν = ἀνὰ τὸ τυχόν.)

**3.** *Wherefore.*] Sense and connection: 'Because the experiences of spirit-gifted men could not be known to you, O Corinthians, in your then heathen infatuation, and inasmuch as in your letter to me you put the question—Who in general is a God-inspired speaker and who not, and by what moral touchstone are we to test them?—learn ye who have abandoned that wretched *once* for the happy *now*, that the criterion of Christian inspiration is *the confession of Jesus as Lord*, a divine watchword that can only be uttered from the heart in the power of God's Holy Spirit' There is indeed a terrible negative running parallel to this positive, which is, *anathema is Jesus.* This execration comes from tongues *not* set in motion by the Holy Ghost. The Christian says *Lord* (verbum solenne in LXX. for Hebr. JEHOVAH) *is Jesus!* The antichristian Jew (see Bengel) says *Accursed is Jesus!* Render λέγει **saith** and εἰπεῖν **say**, and read Ἰησοῦς. The personal name *Jesus* is better than the official title *Christ* here, as denoting the *historical* Messiah of the Christian's faith, the Lord exalted to the same throne with God.

**4.** Connection: there is no changeableness in the one watchword of the believing heart, no variation of sound in the one keynote of God-inspired speech, which is evermore *Jesus is Lord!* Yet, notwithstanding this constant and loyal monotone, there are manifold distinctions of *charismata* in the church. These miraculous endowments wrought by the grace of God, these supersensuous powers designed to operate for the edification of the community, and therefore appropriated to special individuals, adjusted in kind to their several natures and meted out in measure according to their capacities—some greater, others less—*all* proceed from one and the same Spirit. But corresponding to these distinctions of *grace-gifts*, all derived from the *same Spirit*, are distinctions of *ministries* all appointed by the *same Lord*, definite channels within which the grace-gifts are manifested; and besides these two, there are, thirdly, distinctions of *miracles* all springing from the *same God*, who worketh them all in all, who being the First Cause originates all the gifts in all the gifted.

This passage, from Chrysostom and Theodoret downwards, has been ever regarded as a bulwark of Trinitarian truth. For reasons why the order of Personal sequence commences with the Holy Ghost, see Introduction to this chapter. It should be carefully observed that here *the same Spirit* connotes the *Personality*· this is quite clear from the analogues in the context of *the same Lord* and *the same God;* but in ver. 3, where it is stated that it is a moral impossibility to say *Lord Jesus* save in the element of Holy Spirit, the *effluence* of the living Power comes to view, the *shine* of the sun, the divine spirit-atmosphere which the inner man breathes when the outer man speaks.

**7.** One and the same Tripersonal Deity

Digitized by Google

Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.

8 For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;

9 To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;

10 To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to ano-

---

originates and operates: **yet in the Christian society to individuals is given the manifestation of the Spirit with a view to the common weal.**

**8.** These nine *charismata* are not easy to classify, and probably the Apostle had in view no strict logical arrangement.

*The word of wisdom.*] I.e. discourse, bearing upon the higher wisdom and deeper doctrines of God's counsel of redemption; exposition, that elucidates these inner truths and makes them plain for practical purposes.

*The word of knowledge* implies a less practical than speculative discussion of the same profound truths regarded as the divine philosophy of Christianity: it means discourse, theoretic or scientific, about the profounder mysteries; see ch. xiii. 2.

**9.** *Faith* here denotes something higher than the *fides salvifica*, common to all Christians, and something wider than the *fides miraculosa* of Matt. xvii. 20, being the mother or condition not only of cures and of miracles, but also of prophetic speech and of discernment of spirits: to this effect Meyer, who also well terms it *a heroism of faith.* "To another grace-gifts of cures:" ἰάματα = miraculous cures of bodily distempers effected not by natural skill, but by spiritual power: under this class came castings out of demons.

**10.** *To another the working of miracles.*] Or more exactly, "expressions in act of God-given powers:" under this class came restoring the dead to life.

*to another prophecy.*] Render: **prophesying.** The Apostle in these chapters lays considerable stress on the gift of prophetic announcement. In this *charisma*, 'prediction of the future' is only one of several forms of revelation or of vision communicated to the prophet or seer. The idea of *foretelling* does not essentially belong to the word προφήτης; the πρό has a kind of local reference.

*The prophet* is one who, standing *in the foreground of God*, announces on divine impulse and with divine power truths unveiled to his spiritual perception. These truths, often significant of salvation, it is his office to *report for the welfare of the community.* He receives them in his own higher spirit; unto which, as to an observatory of heavenly visions, his life for a season withdraws itself, and where shrinking from all contact with externals, it becomes "a seeing eye, a hearing ear, a perceiving sense" for the things of eternity or of the future. What the prophet thus receives in the sanctuary of his spirit or meeting-place of the two worlds, that he *announces through the medium of the subordinate mind and its outflowing speech:* for in the prophetic ecstasy the three constituents of the spirit-nature, *noûs* and *logos* and *pneuma*, continue in unbroken communication with each other. If he be a seer, he contemplates that which is seen, not as it is in itself, but as it comes to view in a symbol: this symbol is divinely formed for the purpose and often accommodated to the man's natural bent or educational mode of thought, being chiefly framed out of materials found in his subjectivity. The prophet is not indeed, like the subject of the *mystic* ecstasy, rapt or caught up to the confines of the third heaven or blissfully translated into the Paradise of God; but from the reciprocal immanence of the human spirit and of the divine, there arise manifestations to his mind in a clothing or colouring borrowed from his individual nature. The supersensuous which he is permitted to behold, passes immediately (as remarked above) through his own *noûs* into *logos*, and thus in the form of speech travelling through his mouth out of himself enters the ears and the *noûs* of the listening congregation and so becomes *intelligible* and therefore *profitable* to the assembled church: see ch. xiv. 3, 4, 5 . . . Some of the above ideas are taken from Bibl. Psych. p. 420 . . . It may be added that St. Paul (2 Cor. xii.) seems to have experienced the *mystic* ecstasy, in which *abit animus, manet anima* (Lactantius); and it is said that Thomas Aquinas in his last illness, awaking out of a long mystic ecstasy, exclaimed *Arcana verba audivi.* In the *prophetic* ecstasy, the *arcana verba* are reported, as they are received, for the good of the church.

In the *glossolalia* or *exalted utterance of tongues in ecstatic elevation of spirit*, alluded to in ver. 11 of this chapter, the supreme spirit of the ecstatic utterer, encompassed and penetrated by the Holy Spirit, in adoring raptures of supernatural prayer (*spiritalis oratio*, Tertull.) soaring beyond the range of

Digitized by Google

ther *divers* kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues:

11 But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.

12 For as the body is one, and

---

the rational apprehension, fails to find its natural expression in rational speech or *logos* begotten of *noûs:* accordingly it resorts to supernatural expression of blissful experience, not indeed in speech engendered of the mind, but in a *tongue created of the Spirit.* These instantaneously spirit-created tongues appear now to be in their character as little known to ourselves, separated from them as we are by so many centuries, as they were then unintelligible to the Corinthian church, unless there happened to be present in the assembly one specially gifted with the charisma of *interpretation of tongues.* One thing seems certain, that this extemporised creation and irrepressible utterance of unknown tongues was quite distinct from the speaking in foreign languages (Acts ii.). In the charisma of glossolalia the ecstatic became so to speak *linguific:* he was during his rapture of adoration an inspired γλωσσοποιός.

10.—(*continued.*) *To another discernings of spirits.*] i.e. in each instance of utterance, the power of rightly judging whether the utterance comes from the Holy Ghost or from the human spirit unaided or from delusive spirits of demons (1 Tim. i. 4): "for there was at that time a great diversity of false prophets, the devil ambitiously striving to plant in rivalry by the side of God's Truth his own Lie." Chrysostom.

*divers kinds of tongues.*] These unknown tongues of divers kinds are perhaps to be identified with the *new tongues* of Mark xvi. 17. If so, were these *new tongues* or γλῶσσαι καιναί connected with the *new creation* or καινὴ κτίσις? Rapturous ejaculations of the *new man* or καινὸς ἄνθρωπος? Glimpses or specimens, pledges or forestalments (passing with the passing ecstasy) of the future glorified speech of the glorified saints? They cannot be identified, as stated before, with the foreign or *other tongues* than Aramaic, which brake forth from the Galileans "according as the Spirit granted them to *give voice*" (ἀποφθέγγεσθαι) in Acts ii., because glossolalia is always connected with supernatural *prayer* and ecstatic *adoration.* The *kinds of tongues* in this text of St. Paul may be rather identified with those of the second outpouring of the Spirit—upon the Gentiles—described in Acts x. 46: and equally so with those of another effusion upon twelve neophytes (Acts xix. 6) who "uttered in tongues and prophesied:" where, as in these chapters, the two *distinct* charismata are conjoined. It may be added that of the three above cited instances from the Acts of App. in (1) the disciples were instantaneously filled (ἐπλήσθησαν) with Holy Spirit before they spake in foreign tongues, in (2) "the free gift of the Holy Ghost is outpoured upon them" ere "they uttered in tongues and magnified God," in (3) "the Holy Ghost (in His effects) came upon them, and they uttered in tongues and prophesied." Clear as day is the miraculous character of these three charismata, viz. speaking in other languages than the native, utterances in new tongues, prophetic announcement. In all of these the power of God was both a 'preventing' and a 'furthering' power: it was impelling and sustaining, for first "the Spirit fell sudden upon them" (ἐπέπεσεν, Acts x. 44), and then they proceeded and continued to utter in the kind and in the degree (ἐλάλουν καθώς, Acts ii. 4) in which the Spirit granted them to give voice. In the gl ssolalia the divine Spirit was the immediately originative and steadily operative producer in the human spirit of new tongues moulded by new views and descriptive of a new state and fitted for high intercourse with God, while the human spirit again was the conscious recipient of the same and the delighted reproducer of them in utterances worthy to give expression to its own sensations of adoring jubilancy. The plural *kinds* because the kinds of tongues would in tone and in form, like faithful echoes, correspond to the kinds of divine communications: these last would vary in degree, if not in kind also, accommodating themselves with ready elasticity to the individual nature and capacity of the human spirit-organ.

11. Emphasis on *all*, which has for its correlate *the one and the same.* Sense is: what a diversity of results, but what unity of principle behind them all! Even as in artificial waterworks, or in a playing fountain, numerous jets and spouts and rills, more or less brilliant, are different manifestations of one unseen element, operative of them all.

*dividing severally to each.*] Rather, **distinguishing properly to each**, i.e. in kind and mode and measure suited to the receptivity of the individual. In *vv.* 4, 5, διαιρέσεις means *distinctions*, not 'distributions' as Meyer, who so renders it because he thinks that διαιροῦν here must mean 'distributing:' rather διαμερίζον or διαδιδοῦν to express that idea. The *personality* of the Holy Ghost is distinctly implied in the word *listeth.*

12. The multiplicity of gifts harmonised

Digitized by Google

hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also *is* Christ.

13 For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or [1]Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

[1]Gr. *Greeks.*

14 For the body is not one member, but many.

15 If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

16 And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

---

in the unity of the Giver is illustrated by the human organism of one body in many members and many members in one body. Similarly in Aristotle the purpose of the state is the *unity of a whole*, a totality in manifold harmony consisting of members mutually dependent and organically connected with each other and with the entire community. This illustration is immediately transferred from the natural organism of the human body to the spiritual organism of the Church here designated by the title of its head, *the Christ.*

13. The harmonious growth and gradual coalition of the many-membered community into a single totality in the all-combining unity of the Holy Ghost, is founded upon the fact that **in one spiri also we all into one body were baptised.** *One* and *all* are here again, as so often in St. Paul's epistles, in contrasted correlation; they are, in fact, mutually complementary: the idea expanded is, unity must dominate multiplicity, until the myriads upon myriads of living members of what nationality soever and of what social status soever, all of them one by one engrafted into the church through the coming centuries of the Gentile Aeon. shall from a growing multiplicity become a settled totality at the Parousia. *Into one body*='with a view to forming one body:' common use of εἰς; compare εἰς ἄφεσιν= 'with a view to obtaining remission.'

*we have been all made to drink into one Spirit.*] This translation is inaccurate and feeble: the εἰς in the text should be omitted. Render **and we all with one Spirit were drenched:** were drenched when and how? In that *outpouring* of the Holy Ghost, which followed the submersion of baptism, we were all *spiritually drenched.* No doubt here flashes across the writer's mind the first grand instalment of the spiritual outpouring on the Pentecostal birthday of the infant Church, when the ascended Christ, having from His Father received gifts for men, largely communicated the same in the descent of the Holy Ghost. The special allusion, however, is to the after-effusion of these miraculous gifts, in which St. Paul and his Corinthian converts were consciously interested.

In this verse 13, the latter half contains no allusion whatever to the *Lord's Supper*, as Estius and many: nor does the *whole* verse refer to *baptism*, as Chrysostom and others: but the first clause refers to baptism, the initiative sacrament, and the second to the effusion of grace-gifts that followed upon it. The full sense then will be, 'As in the laver of regeneration we were all baptised in the element of one Spirit breathing into our hearts faith and hope and the ordinary graces, so in the subsequent out pouring of the extraordinary charismata we were all drenched with one Spirit coming "like a flood" or "rivers of delight" upon our inmost spirits.'

14. Render, **For the body also is not . . .** Again reappears the illustration of unequal charismata from the human organism, now in curious detail. The connection with the foregoing is plain enough: we many members of the Christ or the Church were *all* drenched with *one* Spirit outpoured from a single Fountain, yet not outpoured in a single form of manifestation common to all believers, but in several kinds and degrees of manifestation fitted to each receiver: for the human body also is not one undifferentiated member but many diversified. Apposite to this illustration is the fable (Liv. ii. 32) addressed by Menenius Agrippa to the mutinous plebs.

15. Render afresh, **If the foot should say, Because I am not hand, I am not of the body, it is not on account of this** (peevish ejaculation) **not of the body—is it?** The first *not* negatives the second: the mark of interrogation is better away: if it is put, it amounts only to a semi-interrogation like our *eh?* or *is it?* Here παρά=*along of* and τοῦτο=*this* querulous declaration uttered by the discontented foot as deploring its own lot of inferiority to the hand. Others explain: the foot does not, because it is not hand, on that account cease to be part of the body. The application to ambitious rivalries and contentious jealousies among the mercurial Corinthians is obvious.

16. Render, **If the ear should say, Because I am not eye . . .**

Digitized by Google

17 If the whole body *were* an eye, where *were* the hearing? If the whole *were* hearing, where *were* the smelling?

18 But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him.

19 And if they were all one member, where *were* the body?

20 But now *are they* many members, yet but one body.

21 And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.

22 Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary:

23 And those *members* of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we [1]bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely

[1] Or, *put on*.

---

**17.** Render, **If all the body were eye, where were the hearing?** For example, we might say, if all the church were overseer or bishop, where would be evangelist or preacher? The two are mutually complementary: they are necessary one to the other and both to the community.

It should be noted with what skill St. Paul places together *foot* and *hand* as belonging to the middle classes of the bodily society, *ear* and *eye* as moving in the highest circles: the reason is not far to seek; jealousies arise between the *almost* equal: where much disparity of rank is, there no rivalry is: for true is the ancient proverb καὶ κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ κοτέει καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων, *potter with potter, joiner with joiner jars.* (Hesiod. Op. 25).

**18. But now, you see, God set:** not *hath set*, the aorist points to the time of man's creation. *Now* in *logical*, not temporal sense: *as it is.*

**19.** Again an *abductio ad adsurdum* as in ver. 17. Sense is: if all instead of being many were one member, where would be the body, which in its very idea has many members?

**20.** Render, **But now, as many members, so one body.** The μέν and δέ present different aspects of the same idea. It may also be rendered *many members, yet one body.*

**21.** Hitherto this figure of a manifold membership, coadjusted and harmonised in a single corporeity, has been employed to rebuke the *discontented inferiors* among the spirit-gifted in the Corinthian church: it is now further employed to rebuke the *contemptuous superiors.* Connection: if it be absurd that the foot should murmur at its own position in the body and should covet the somewhat higher capacity of hand, equally preposterous is it that the head should despise the feet or the eye look down upon the hand. All opposites or variants, high and low, weak and strong, delicate and robust, comely and uncomely (i.e. parts of the body *reputed by man*, τὰ δοκοῦντα, to be uncomely, but being *ethically* rather than physically such), are all absolutely necessary to one another, and that for the furtherance of the individual and of the common weal. What use A lacks, that Z supplies: for how can the head walk through air without the co-operation of the feet? Or how can the eye without the hand, or the hand without the eye write a letter? The proper use of both organs, directive and executive, must be combined.

**22.** *Nay*, on the contrary, what parts of the body *seem* to be contemptible, so far from meeting with contemptuousness, actually receive from us attention much more (*a fortiori*), as being absolutely necessary in themselves and actually distinguished by us with more than ordinary honour in the form of raiment. There seems to be an allusion in these verses to Gen. iii. 21, "The Lord God made coats of skins and clothed them." These coats of skins were as *honour covering shame*, i.e. material honour covering moral shame, and in Targum of Onkelos are called "clothing of honour."

**23, 24, 25.** *upon these we bestow more abundant honour.*] Rather, **On these we put** in the form of apparel *honour extraordinary in comparison* with the comely face which with the neck and hands and feet is left bare and exposed to weather and to view. In these verses the rendering and the punctuation of A.V. are both faulty. Put a comma after the first ἔχει at end of ver. 23, and a full stop or dash after the second ἔχει, and render all together, **And our uncomely or unseemly parts have** in the adornment of attire **a comeliness more exceeding, whereas our comely parts have or feel no need** that they should be decked with "the clothing of honour." Then in the sentence immediately following, the *but* (ἀλλά) sums up the whole argument with emphatic and authoritative abruptness; render; **But, the truth is, God it was who tempered the body together giving** or assigning **to that which shrinks behind the rest, a more exuberant honour,** in the extraneous and superadded (περισσὸν) garniture of apparel,

Digitized by Google

*parts* have more abundant comeliness.

24 For our comely *parts* have no need: but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that *part* which lacked:

25 That there should be no [1]schism in the body; but *that* the members should have the same care one for another.

[1] Or, *division.*

26 And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.

27 Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

28 And God hath set some in

---

**that there should be no breach** (σχίσμα in *ethical* sense) **in the body, but** on the contrary that **the members should have the same care one for another.**

Critical notes on the above: It is plain on the surface of the language that St. Paul here almost personifies the human body and members. The last clause, "have the same *solicitude*" perhaps rather than *care*, proves this. Such personification easily accounts for the middle voice in τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ = *that which feels its own shortcoming* in comparison with other parts of the body: it is the middle voice of *consciousness*: see ch. i. 7, and note. In ver. 25, **that** *there* **should** *be*, ἵνα is used in the subjectively ecbatic sense denoting *contemplated* result: A.V. quite right in its rendering, not right Alford and Meyer.

*More exceeding* or *exuberant* means in ver. 24 a seemliness *in excess* or *surplusage* of the other members, and denotes *nature adorned* versus the same nature *unadorned*, i.e. God's gift of clothing *added* to God's gift of creation.

**26.** On this text Chrysostom shrewdly comments to this effect: "As when by chance a thorn is planted in the heel, all the body manifests a fellow-feeling; back bends, paunch and thighs are drawn together, hands like attendants or esquires approach the wounded part and proceed to extract the painful fixture: head stoops, eyes look sad, the brow is delved with parallels of solicitude." In the above all the members, feeling and expressing sympathy with one member suffering, correspond to the *homo* or *ego* in Plato's Polit. p. 462: When one's finger is hurt, such is the fellow-feeling which spreads along the body to the soul until it reaches the ruling principle that, the whole condoling with the part afflicted, the man says not "my finger is in pain," but *I have a pain in my finger* (ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸν δάκτυλον ἀλγεῖ).

**27.** *Now ye* **are body of Christ.**] According to St. Paul every single church, whether Corinthian or Ephesian, is either the ideal Temple of God or, as here, the ideal Body of Christ. Each Christian community is the Church Universal in miniature or in microcosm; but at the same time it is such *rudimentally*, not in its completeness.

*And members in particular.*] Most modern commentators explain ἐκ μέρους to mean "regarded from the view-point of lot or function in the church." That is, individuals in it are members of Christ, but not members without distinctions, not as if every one could be *any* member: there are diversities of grace-gifts adapted to diversities of natures: this to rebuke Corinthian rivalries. This view makes excellent sense, but against it must be alleged the form of phrase ἐκ μέρους: for if St. Paul had meant to express this idea, which he has expressed already, would he not have written εἷς ἕκαστος or καθ' ἕκαστον μέρος? Most likely: this objection from language seems serious.

Chrysostom makes it to mean *members of a part*, i.e. of a part of the Church Catholic. This translation of his suits the Greek phrase well, but his interpretation is questionable, as not according with the use or rather *idea* of the rare expression ἐκ μέρους in the next chapter, where it occurs four times and nowhere else in N.T. What sense it bears there, it most probably bears here. Viewed in the light of that sense the meaning in this verse will be **members of a part**, i.e. *Christ's members belonging to a side of the ideal Church*, even to the earthly and rudimentary side marked by imperfection, which has for its other side the heavenly, the absolutely perfect. Compare ἐκ μέρους contrasted with τέλειον in ch. xiii. 10. The whole temporal side of the Catholic Church militant upon earth, in its crude and rudimentary form, from first to last, is here presented to view: the reverse of this obverse, the convex of this concave, is the eternal and blissful side of the same Church triumphant in heaven, which now indeed belongs to the *noöumena* or realities of the *phenomena*. This unseen spiritual organism or edifice shall be unveiled in its glorified form at the Parousia.

It should be well noted that in the clause *ye are Body of Christ* the absence of the article indicates *quality* of substance: see remarks on this in ch. vi. 2. Compare 'the



Digitized by Google

the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, [1]diversities of tongues.

29 *Are* all apostles? *are* all prophets? *are* all teachers? *are* all [1]workers of miracles?

30 Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?

31 But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way.

[1] Or, *kinds*.

[1] Or, *powers*.

Word was *God'* (θεός). Meyer justly calls it *qualitative*.

This is one of many passages in St. Paul's epistles pointing to the inner doctrine, that as by virtue of our union with Adam we derive from him in the elements of our nature the ethical and physical substratum of his corporeity, so from our union with the new Head of the new Creation we are reconstituted out of the elements of Christ's hallowed Humanity and are here rudimentally consubstantiated with Him in the threefold nature of body and soul and spirit. Nothing short of this seems to satisfy the plain and simple language of St. Paul, here and elsewhere. Our incorporation into Christ, founded in baptism, strengthened and nourished in the Lord's Supper, issues in our complete spiritual concorporeity with Him to be manifested at the Parousia.

**28.** *in the church.*] Catholic, not simply the Corinthian: comp. Ephes. i. 22. *Apostles:* for the origin and import of this title see notes on ch. ix. 1, and for the apostolate's elasticity of limits and for a full and able dissertation on the office see Bp. Lightfoot on Galat. p. 89–97. *Prophets*: see notes on ver. 10. *Teachers:* men whose natural gifts of teaching and acquired knowledge were enhanced by divine illumination. The Apostles professed the manifold fulness of the Spirit, and could work as prophets, teachers, healers, utterers of tongues. *Helps* or *services of help*, the duties of the *diaconate*, such as tending the sick and the poor. *Governments*, administrative functions of the episcopate—*kinds of tongues*, see notes on v. 10.

**29.** Terse and vehement application of the long drawn figure of the human organism, in a series of impassioned interrogatives. As much as to say, the members of the body—are they *all* eyes to oversee? *All* mouths to prophesy? *All* hands to lay on healing? *All* tongues to utter spirit-born and exquisite utterances?

Preposterous! *Non omnia possumus omnes.* In this list of gifts the utterance of tongues is placed *last* as being *least:* so Chrysostom.

**31. Strive ye for the greater gifts**, i.e. the more noble and useful: then with some abruptness, **and besides—I proceed to shew you a surpassing way**, in the ensuing chapter or "Psalm of Love" as Meyer calls it. Upon the present imperfect tense of δείκνυμι Bengel finely observes, *jam ardet* Paulus et *fertur in amorem*. No need of τὴν here: an adverbial substitute for adjective not uncommon: "a *par excellence way*." Compare Eumenides, ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων ἀφρόν.

## CHAPTER XIII.

1 *All gifts*, 2, 3 *how excellent soever, are nothing worth without charity.* 4 *The praises thereof, and* 13 *prelation before hope and faith.*

THOUGH I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become *as* sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

CHAP. XIII.—After a difficult and tedious passage through the previous chapters, this eulogy of charity comes like a haven of rest. The moral drift of the chapter is simply this: while faith is necessary to salvation and hope desirable, love, which is in the spirit and in the will, is absolutely indispensable. It is that *something* without which *anything*, that we may do or suffer, becomes *nothing*. If faith and hope, being human, are "theological virtues," love is much more than this, being divine: for it is not merely an attribute to God Himself, but of His very essence. Hence the Holy Ghost was sometimes termed by the fathers *Caritas*, and the human spirit *dilectio* or kindred capacity of the divine *Caritas*.

'Αγάπη, *charity* or *love*, a word not found in Greek philosophy but "born in the bosom of Christianity," denotes *brotherly love*, which

Digitized by Google

2 And though I have *the gift of* prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

3 And though I bestow all my goods to feed *the poor*, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

4 Charity suffereth long, *and* is kind; charity envieth not; charity [1]vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up,

[1] Or, *is not rash*

---

seeks the good of one's neighbour in a self-denying way. It should be noted that in the first three verses there is *no Greek word* corresponding to the word *though* of the A. V. *κἄν* or *καὶ ἐάν* in each place signifies **and if,** not *even if:* this necessitates the rendering of the Greek (which is not *εἰ ἔχω*) in the hypothetical form, *if I should have* or *possess.*

For reasons why *agapé* is rendered *charity* rather than *love* in this chapter, see note at end of ch. xvi. p. 376.

1. *Glossolalia*, or "utterance in unknown tongues," improvised by the Spirit in tones exquisite and delicate, is set in the forefront. Why so? Because this brilliant charism was by many Corinthians valued higher than less conspicuous but more serviceable gifts. The writer wishes to shew that, compared with the steady-shining star of inextinguishable love, this too attractive tongue-utterance was a fleeting meteor-flash. In these first verses the Apostle in his own person puts cases, which his own experience enabled him in great measure to realise; but these cases being hypothetical, he extends in ver. 1 the glossolalia from its own proper limits of unknown tongues into the domain of all human languages; and beyond that, poetically, into the sphere of heavenly speech *addressed by angels to angels* (not "by angels to men," as some).

*Though I speak with. . . .*] Render and explain: **If in the tongues of men I should utter and** (what would be wonderful) **of angels, yet should not have charity, I am become ringing metal or a shrill-sounding cymbal:** *i.e.* a mere instrument of sound without sense, dead, mechanical, devoid of all moral worth, an organ that requires to be beaten into resonance by a foreign impulse, like a modern gong booming to the touch of a plectrum. Here the diction steps on from the indefinite material of metal to the product of art, a brazen basin. The Greek ἀλαλάζον means clanging or screaming loud and long: *Alalé*, daughter of *Polemos* (Pindar) = prolonged yell of onset in battle.

2. *And though I have . . .*] Render, **And if I should have the gift of prophesying and should understand all the mysteries** (whether revealed or unrevealed) **and all** attainable **knowledge** (such as dives deep into the philosophy of Christianity) **and if I should have all** (possible heroism of) **faith, enough to dislodge mountains, yet should not have charity, I am nothing;**—*a moral cipher.* The *fides miraculosa* without charity would not be *fides salvifica.* Meyer's rendering, "so that I displace mountains," is surely wrong: *ὥστε καὶ μεθίστημι* for that. Compare the familiar *ὥστε θαυμάσαι*, "*enough* to make one wonder:" see note ch. i. 7.

*all knowledge*] It may be noted here that Clemens Romanus in Ep. ad Corinthios twice alludes to *knowledge* as a special gift of the Corinthians. He seems to identify it with a subtle perception of the inner and deeper sense of Scripture and contrasts it with *charity:* chaps. i. and xlviii.

3. *And though I bestow.*] Render, **And if I should dole out in food all my substance, and if I should deliver my body that I be burnt, yet have not charity, not a whit am I profited.** Even self-immolation without charity is unavailing. For instance when a Buddhist ascetic leaps with smiling face on the blazing pyre, immolating his body that he may immortalise his spirit, what does it profit him? Nothing: the fanatic is in love with himself and with no one else: he seeks his own sole happiness whether in the shape of a coming deification or of a present glorification of self (another reading for καυθήσομαι is καυχήσωμαι). It is quite possible that this image of a Buddhist priest with his 'ineffectual fires' suggested the thought of this text to St. Paul; more especially as this Epistle was written in 57 A.D., before the outbreak of Nero's fiery persecution. It should be borne in mind that the Apostle just before his first visit to Corinth had been staying in Athens, where he had certainly seen an altar to the *unknown God*, and had probably seen or heard about the *Tomb of the Indian* with its epitaph *Here lies Zarmanochegas who made his own self immortal.* For further particulars on this matter see Bishop Lightfoot's Note in Ep. Coloss. p. 394: from which the idea of this comment is wholly taken.

*dole out in food.*] Probably not with a touch of sarcasm: yet see note in 'The Collects' (Dean Goulburn) vol. i. p. 244.



Digitized by Google

5 Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil;

6 Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth [1]in the truth;

7 Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

8 Charity never faileth: but whether *there be* prophecies, they

[1] Or, *with the truth.*

---

4. *Charity suffereth long.*] Rather, **charity is long-suffering**, i.e. slow to take umbrage, slow to resent a slight. *Is kind:* that would require χρηστεύει: rather, **is gracious in demeanour.** Compare for the force of middle voice a similar verb ἀρεσκεύομαι, Polyb. = *I play the agreeable, make myself pleasant.*

*vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.*] Περπερεύεται seems to mean **does not show off, makes no display.** If φυσιοῦται also is in midd. voice, as is most probable, it may be rendered, being a word of some coarseness, **does not swell and swagger.** These predicates of charity present the *negative* side of humility: they imply an instinctive shrinking from all false glitter, pompous bluster, strutting in borrowed plumes, from *exaggerated* words, looks, tone, style; in short, a rooted hatred of *seeming to be more than one is.*

5. **Does not behave unseemly,** or perhaps **unmannerly.** How the inner man gives expression to the outer. So far from "manners making the man," old proverb, *the man makes the manners.* That charm of manner which goes straight to the heart because it comes fresh from the heart, that touch of tenderness which makes it a pleasure to receive what is clearly a pleasure to give, is one of the many moral fruits of the divine root: this winning deportment is based upon the principle of respect for God's image in man; "why dost *thou* set at nought thy *brother?*" Rom. xiv. 10.

**Seeketh not her own:** acts and speaks from disinterested motives: the germ of this conduct is the rare quality of *unselfishness. Is not easily provoked*, or **flies not into a rage** (midd. voice again, probably): ever keeps the rising temper under control. *Thinketh no evil:* render, **Takes no account of an ill turn,** i.e. does not mentally register or make a memorandum of an evil done to itself, but allows it to glance off unrecorded. This is the cardinal virtue of *forgiveness of injuries.*

6. *Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but...*] Render: —**Rejoiceth not over wrongdoing, but rejoiceth with the truth:** does not exult at the spectacle of any immoralities committed by others, but rejoices with a holy joy in the triumph of the Truth of God: has a fellow-feeling of delight with the absolute Truth, as it comes to historic view in the actions of good men.

7. *Beareth all things.*] A. V. not right here: for this idea occurs below in the word "endureth." Besides, the Greek στέγειν properly means either to *keep in,* as a cup holds wine, or to *keep out,* as a house-roof or a waterproof keeps out rain. The essential sense is that of **tightness,** whether of tightness against pressure of the *inward* or of the *outward* circumstances determine. Render here, as in ch. ix. 12, **is proof in all things,** or **keepeth all things,** i.e. is *proof against all* such things perhaps as provocations in the shape of studied affronts or shafts of slander. The application, however, may be *holds tight* or *keeps close* all deposited trusts. The essential sense, in this case, remains unimpaired: the circumstantial varies.

*believeth all things.*] Not here the weakness of credulity, but the guilelessness of a simple and unsuspecting mind, which is itself based upon an unblemished life, for according to the proverb, *Evil doers, evil thinkers.* It is the innocency of Love that "delightedly believes Divinities, being *itself divine.*"

*endureth all things.*] Here is the cardinal virtue of *fortitude*, the cheerful hardihood and loyal sense of duty, evinced by Christ's faithful soldier and servant in meeting all shocks of temptation and "all assaults of our enemies:" for ὑπομένειν often means to bide the brunt of encounter in battle.

It should be well noted that these fine touches and features of charity are not drawn like an exquisite painting, that may be carried into a gallery and hung up to a wall, and left there as "a thing of beauty," to be admired through long generations. Rather we behold in this unequalled picture a *breathing original* to be translated into daily and hourly life, a living power and divine principle communicated to the human spirit and working in the human will, conquering by constant counteraction, planting noble opposites to meet inferior, checkmating earth with heaven, overcoming evil by good, vanquishing arrogance by gentleness, insolence by courtesy, peevishness by patience, malice by guilelessness, vindictiveness by alacrity in forgiving and all assaults of ghostly enemies by a steady front of determined resistance and invincible courage. St. Paul, no doubt, approached his own ideal: *O si sic omnes!*

8. After the distinctive *attributes* is now presented tersely and strongly the divine *attitude* of charity, the attitude of one *never falling* but evermore standing upright. Here as often elsewhere, the Apostle's mind glances

Digitized by Google

shall fail; whether *there be* tongues, they shall cease; whether *there be* knowledge, it shall vanish away.

9 For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

10 But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

11 When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I

---

through the Gentile Aeon straight at the Parousia and contemplates Charity, amid the dissolution of physical surroundings, standing upon the spiritual Creation now disencrusted from its material envelope, herself too disencumbered of alien time and of transitory knowledge and of phenomenal prophesyings and of sensational tongue-utterances, and at last triumphant in her own serene and untrammelled eternity, from which she had condescended for a season to be an exile with man. This idea, more or less, is substantially apparent from one or two terms in this verse significant of the Advent and also from the *aorists future.* It should be noted that οὐδέποτε, stronger than οὔποτε, means something like *no never.*

Render and explain **Charity never faileth** —*no never*, but, even when all around is falling and in motion, remains steadfast and unmoved (βεβαία, ἀσάλευτος, ἀκίνητος διαμένουσα, Theodoret in loco): *faileth* of the A.V. not true to the true idea. Sense of the whole is, Charity being supersensuous and imperishable, shall amid the shaking of the things that are shaken abide alone unshaken; but as to your brilliant charisms, O Corinthians, at the Parousia **prophesyings if there be** (εἴτε implies an easy air of indifference to things in themselves indifferent by comparison, serving for a time as a mere scaffolding to God's building) **they shall be done away, and tongues if there be, they shall cease, and knowledge if there be** (searching, inquisitive knowledge), **it shall be done away.** For what is our present *knowledge?* Good, as far as it goes, but still nothing more than the alphabet of language or the rudiments of the true *wisdom.* And what are our *glossolalies* or *tongue-chatterings?* Fleeting flashes, smart smatterings, fine stammerings of our *spiritual infancy:* but these preparatory prattlings shall at the Parousia be transfigured into articulation and intelligibility in the Paradisiacal speech of our spiritual manhood. For when our *new humanity* shall be completely consubstantiated with the long ago glorified humanity of the ascended Christ, then shall the *new tongues* themselves be glorified, and our now spirit-given *lisping* shall become spirit-given *speaking.* And what again are these vaunted *prophesyings?* Good also, as coming from God, but still revelations for a season only, meted out in measure meet to our now limited capacities; intelligible indeed to ourselves and to others because from our spirit they pass through our *noûs* and thence through our mouth and thence into the ears and *noûs* of our hearers. But even *prophesyings* are grace-gifts restricted in our own narrowness, just like our so-called scientific *knowledge*, which therefore "puffeth up" (ch. viii. 2), because it is so little and so onesided. All this must *needs* be: **for it is from a part** of the complete whole **that we know** what we know **and it is from a part** only **that we do prophesy:** it is from the earthset end of the angelic ladder which in its other end is planted in heaven, it is on this world's plane of that *childhood*, which attains its *full stature* in the world to come, that we acquire knowledge and announce prophecies.

N.B. The true idea of the rare phrase ἐκ μέρους in ver. 9, may be gathered from its contrast τὸ τέλειον = *fullgrown* or *perfect* in ver. 10, and more plainly still from ver. 11, where νήπιος has for its contrast ἀνήρ. It is clear as day from these three verses taken together that ἐκ μέρους : νήπιος = τὸ τέλειον : ἀνήρ. Compare also Ephes. iv. 13, 14: where ἀνὴρ τέλειος and νήπιοι are in contrast.

**10.** *is come.*] ἔλθῃ, a word significant of the Parousia or Advent. *Then shall be done away* or be brought to nought *that which appertains to a part* of the complete whole, viz. *prophesyings* and *tongue-utterances* and imperfect *knowledge.*

**11.** *I spake as a child.*] *I spake* is an unfortunate rendering, precisely what St. Paul did *not* mean: render **as an infant I talked** (λέγειν= 'to speak rationally and articulately,' λαλεῖν= 'to talk,' 'prate,' 'chatter.' Comp. the pungent line of Eupolis λαλεῖν ἄριστος, ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν).

In these three chapters λαλεῖν γλώσσαις has been rendered "to *utter* in tongues," not "to *speak*," which would be untrue to St. Paul's idea. Possibly *talk* might in some places be somewhat better, as the word *glossolalia* or 'talking in tongues' denotes such utterances as were simply unintelligible without the aid of a specially gifted interpreter. No doubt glosso*lalia* is indicated in the *I talked* here, as *prophesying* and *knowledge* are in the other two clauses. Νήπιος according to its etymon means *infant.* Render the last clause, **since I am become a man I have done with the ways of an infant.**

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *reasoned.* [1]thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

[1] Gr. *in a riddle.* 12 For now we see through a glass, [1]darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

13 And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these *is* charity.

---

12. *For now we see through a glass darkly.*] Render: **for we look just now through a mirror in a riddle**: i.e. in the midst of an enigma. This passage is to us obscure: its full interpretation seems to demand a personal knowledge of supersensuous experiences that move on a higher plane than the low level of modern Christianity. The Corinthian bronzes and metallic mirrors were famous. These ancient mirrors were smooth flat plates of bell-metal, a mixture of copper and tin, which when polished is whiter than silver: but the images seen in them were somewhat *dim* and *indistinct.* At the same time it should be noted that these mirrors in Corinth may have been made of the ancient *glass,* such as was used in Nineveh and in Pompeii: this glass is known to modern research: in that case the images seen in them would be more or less *distorted.* These looking-glasses were not like ours, with quicksilvered backs. St. Paul's idea in this verse, appears to be: *At present we look not straight at realities but through a mirror at their reflection,* at a reflection dim and vague or misshapen. It may be rendered *we see by means of a mirror,* i.e. mediately and imperfectly, not yet directly and face to face. The phrase *in a riddle* may have been added impressively, in order to reproduce, reiterate the same idea of unreality or indistinctness in a new cognate form of mysteriousness: sense then will be *in the presence of a profound riddle, with a problem before us and around us which we cannot solve.* It is possible however that the Apostle meant, "We look through a vague medium *on* a dark enigma:" the Greek probably would not object to ἐν where εἰς is more common.

The enigma itself may be God's deep counsel of redemption, the contents of the gospel, which is a central mystery revealed, yet environed by a margin of mysteries unrevealed.

*but then face to face.*] After the Parousia we shall contemplate the Reality face to face, i.e. *standing face* (πρόσωπον, nom. case) *to face* with the absolutely True: *immediate* will be the Vision: the material mirror of dismantled creation shall have been shattered and swept away, and the spiritual archetypes shall come to view, and then the *solution* of the grand problem shall commence.

12. Render and explain, **Just now I know from a part** (or side of the complete whole, from one plane of the solid cube), **but then I shall know in full, even as I was also known in full.** *I am known* of the A.V. is incorrect, because of the Past Aorist. In this verse S. Paul, like one acquainted with divine transitions, swiftly takes his stand upon a height in the future beyond the Parousia, from which he looks back upon his speck of earth-life, the scene of his conversion and ecstasies and visions and prophesyings and preachings and sufferings, in all of which he was in communion with God and was thoroughly known of Him. It should be noted that καθὼς means 'according as,' i.e. *in what manner or measure.* From this it appears that our completed knowedge of God hereafter will bear some proportion to the knowledge He condescended to take of us here: for in this verse is described not the intellectual *scire* but the moral *nôsse* or the personal knowledge of *spiritual affection based upon affinity of character.* See Additional Note on ch. viii. 1. This view does not exclude the idea of future progression in knowledge whether intellectual or moral, because the verb here used denotes properly **after**-*knowledge* whether in the form of *recognition* or of a higher knowledge superadded to a lower, just like storey upon storey in a *rising* edifice: it does not denote absolute or coronal completeness, like a capital set upon a column, so as to exclude future growth and enlargement in the kingdom. In the state of perfection even there are degrees of ascension: in eternity when shall the summit of Perfection be attained?

13. *And now.*] Render **So now, you see,** (logical sense of νυνί) **abideth faith, hope, charity.** *Abideth* of the A.V. quite correct: much better grammar than *abide,* as some; for the plural factors are regarded as a singular whole in the one common property of continuance. Full sense: those splendid gifts of prophesyings and of tongue-utterances together with ambitious knowledge shall vanish, but this modest triad of graces shall remain: in this triad of graces, however, greater than the other two is—charity. For faith and hope are human, moral attitudes of the soul firmly trusting and fondly waiting; whereas love is simply divine, coming down from heaven on the day of Pentecost and leaving earth with the risen saints to meet the Lord returning. Nevertheless, faith and hope too shall abide and survive the Parousia; but our brilliant charismata, O Corinthians, shall not abide; they shall then be no more.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XIV.

1 *Propnecy is commended,* 2, 3, 4 *and preferred before speaking with tongues,* 6 *by a comparison drawn from musical instruments.* 12 *Both must be referred to edification,* 22 *as to their true and proper end.* 26 *The true use of each is taught,* 27 *and the abuse taxed.* 34 *Women are forbidden to speak in the church.*

FOLLOW after charity, and desire spiritual *gifts*, but rather that ye may prophesy.

2 For he that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man [1]understandeth *him;* howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mvsteries.

[1] Gr. *heareth.*

3 But he that propnesieth speaketh unto men *to* edification, and exhortation, and comfort.

4 He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church.

5 I would that ye all spake with

---

CHAP. XIV. After the noble episode or parenthesis of charity, the Apostle returns to the charismata and shows, at some length, that, while all of them should be coveted and none despised, nevertheless *prophesying* as being profitable to the congregation, is superior to *talking in tongues;* for this last endowment is beneficial only to the individual, unless indeed it be accompanied by the gift of interpretation and expounded thereby. It should be borne in mind that the more excitable and vainglorious of the Corinthians were inclined to make an intemperate exhibition of the more brilliant but less edifying glossolalia. It may also be noted that in ver. 9 the articled γλῶσσα denotes the physical organ: elsewhere in these chapters it always means an abstract tongue created by the divine Spirit and by the human in mutual immanence. For the fuller understanding of this chapter the reader may consult the Introductory Remarks to c. xii. and the comments on xii. 10.

1. Rendering in full; **Pursue after love, meantime, however, eagerly desire the spirit-gifts, yet more than all the rest that ye prophesy.** *Definitive* use of *that*, not *final* or *telic*.

2. Compare 2 Cor. v. 13 and render:—**For whoso uttereth in a tongue, not unto men uttereth he, but unto God.** Why so? Because he holds high converse with God in the shrine of his own transfigured spirit, between which and the thinking faculty or *noûs* communications are intercepted and suspended during the ecstasy. How then can his ecstatic utterances, unless they have passed through the reflective *noûs* into *logos* or rational and articulated speech, become utterances intelligible to ordinary men? Impossible: in the rapture of adoration or supernatural prayer the talking does not condescend to become speaking: the supersensuous utterances are more or less audible as marvellous mutterings or chatterings in exquisite tones, but not in the least intelligible in themselves without the added gift of interpretation. In next verse a reason is assigned; **for no one hears** (i.e. so as to understand; no one has an inner ear), **as** (δέ) **it is in the Spirit that the man utters what are—mysteries.** Emphasis on *spirit* and on *mysteries.* Fuller sense; no one but an interpreter, one who is specially gifted to comprehend the drift of the divine communications and to reproduce it in the form of current human speech, has a perceiving ear for such utterances of spirit-created tongues, which in fact are akin to the ἄρρητα ῥήματα that fell on the Apostle's spiritual ear from God's Paradise: 2 Cor. xii.

3. Render:—**Whereas** (δέ) **whoso prophesies** (i.e. announces and reports divine secrets communicated to him in an ecstasy), **unto men uttereth he** (what? That which is *in effect*) **edification and exhortation and word of comfort**—παραμυθίαν=*address to the heart* or *side* of a person, 'word of comfort.' The utterances of the prophet, or inspired herald of divine intelligence, are *utterances unto men*, because from his own inmost spirit, or pneuma of the human pneuma possessed and controlled by the divine Pneuma, they pass through his reflective *noûs* into *logos* and from utterances become articulated speech and therefore intelligible to others.

The phrase *utters edification* is in its linguistic nature similar to *This* (in effect) *is my body* (see c. xi. 24) and in form is just the same as *eateth a judgment unto himself,* or as *to inherit the promise*, which "promise" is *in effect* the kingdom.

4. Render:—**Whoso uttereth in a tongue, his own self edifieth he, whereas he who prophesies** (or proclaims mysteries) **edifieth a congregation.** The sense of this verse will be plain from what has been said above.

5. 'As many of the spirit-gifted in the Corinthian Church uttered in tongues, the Apostle, lest he should appear from a motive

Digitized by Google

tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater *is* he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying.

6 Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?

7 And even things without life

---

of envy to depreciate the gift of tongues' (Theophylact), proceeds to say with some approbation and yet correctively (render), **Now, while I wish all of you to utter in tongues** (i.e. wish to exclude none of you from doing so), **yet I prefer that you should prophesy;** more literally, *yet still more do I wish that ye prophesy;* being a gift more useful to the community: **as** (δέ) **greater**—morally greater, more serviceable—**is he that prophesieth than he that uttereth in tongues, with exception, unless,** that is, **he should interpret, that the church may get edification.** The last half of this verse clearly shews that one and the same person *might* be endowed with the gift of utterance in tongues and with the gift of interpreting their utterance: comp. v. 13 below. It should be remembered that ὁ διερμηνεύων or 'through-interpreter' was one who was purely inspired to understand the new tongues, *as they were uttered*, whether by himself or by others, and to translate their substance into the current language, that their contents might be 'understanded of the people.'

N.B. Meyer, followed by Alford, makes ἐκτὸς εἰ μή, to be 'a mixture of two constructions, so that μή seems now pleonastic.' This cannot be: the mixture of two constructions is as questionable as the figure Hendiadys or Hysteronproteron, or as the 'combination of purpose and of purport' in ἵνα. Here ἐκτός is *general* and the εἰ μή clause *specific*, defining the general: a very natural mode of expression, especially in an easy-going style, when the writer throws out a general notion as a skirmisher while he prepares at leisure to formulate the particular.

6. Render:—**So now, you see, brethren** (a term of affectionate address), **if I should come unto you uttering in tongues, what shall I profit you?** Nothing, **unless I should give utterance to you either in the way of revelation or of knowledge or of prophesying or of doctrine:** in that case my utterances, as they would *edify*, would also *benefit;* but as to the *glossolalia*, in which you glory so much, well—that is a gift not to be disparaged: it is, no doubt. a splendid endowment, but yet an endowment rather *splendid*, it seems to me, than *useful*, brethren.

N.B. To one accustomed to observe the architecture of Greek sentences it is clear at first sight that in this verse the *if I should come uttering* is a clause conditioning the whole sentence following, namely the apodosis *what shall I profit you* together with its second protasis *unless I should give utterance*, so that to the idea of the first protasis is subordinated the idea of the apodosis, with that of its other protasis. This construction is well known, and Meyer in his 'second thoughts' seems to have adopted it. Nevertheless this explanation cannot be correct: the grammar indeed is blameless and upright, even stately, but against the grammar protests the inexorable logic. For how can St. Paul be made to say in the same breath, 'If I *utter in tongues* I shall not profit you, unless I give utterance in the way of *prophesying?*' The two endowments were not only distinct, but quite different, the one self-edifying and requiring an interpreter, the other edifying the hearers and self-interpreting. If, indeed, there had been a καί before λαλήσω, then the double protasis would yield good sense in serving to *add* a useful charism to a brilliant. But there is no καί: we must therefore dismiss the double protasis and mentally repeating the one apodosis must appropriate to it the second protasis thus: *If I should come uttering in tongues, what shall I profit you?* What shall I profit you in fact, *unless I should give utterance in prophesying?* This sense, which logic seems to require, grammar also permits, being as flexible to this construction as to the other, for it is a known feature of a terse and vehement style to omit a link, when that link may be readily supplied from the context. This view is better also than to retain the structure of two protases and regard the second as *corrective* of the first. That is awkward.

On the four substantives in the last clause of this verse Estius well says, "duo juga, ut conjugata sint revelatio et prophetia, scientia et doctrina;" i. e. not as a team of four oxen *seriatim*, but as two yokes of oxen, each yoke or pair denoting one charism of two sides. In fact this is a fine specimen of the old and useful figure *chiasmos* in the form of A: C=B: D, *revelation* being the condition and foundation of *prophesying*, *knowledge* of *doctrine:* for prophesying is God's revelation being announced to man, doctrine is knowledge formulated

Digitized by Google

giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the [1]sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?

[1] Or, *tunes*.

8 For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?

9 So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words [1]easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.

[1] Gr. *significant*.

10 There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and

---

The A. V. seems right in rendering 'doctrine' rather than 'teaching,' διδασκαλία.

7. Illustration from *musical instruments*, to shew that undistinguishable chatterings, however wonderful and attractive, are not *edifying* to the hearers. *And even things without life:* render:—**Even things inanimate giving a voice, whether flute or harp, if they should give no pause to the sounds**, i. e. allow no distinction of intervals to the notes, **how shall be distinguished a tune that is being played on the flute or on the harp?** Sense is, If the sounding chords be swept with a bewildering dash of rapid continuity, not slowly modulated to the ears of the audience for them to catch the air, how shall a melody or piece of music be sensibly appreciated? In like manner, in order that a congregation may hear and understand, there must be in the utterance of ecstasy an articulation in syllables and in words, which is a characteristic not of glossolalia but of prophesying: otherwise how can the people so hear as to comprehend, so comprehend as to be edified? The exact point of comparison between the instruments and the ecstasies is the discrimination of what is being played and the understanding of what is being uttered.

It may be here observed, that it is plain from this analogy that the glossolalia was not a speaking in foreign languages, which would be *enunciated* and to some hearers intelligible, but a voluble utterance and undecipherable muttering in supernatural and unknown tongues.

8. Confirmation of the negative implied in the words *how shall be recognised* by a more striking illustration. *Impossible! for even if a trumpet* . . . . elliptical use of γάρ very common after an interrogation: render, **why, even if a trumpet** with its rousing blasts significant of warfare **should give an uncertain voice, who shall make ready for battle?** How is the soldier to know whether a charge or a retreat is being sounded, or neither? The bugle-notes must be intelligible and significant.

9. Render:—**So ye also, unless by means of the tongue ye give speech** (λόγον, not λαλίαν) **easy to mark, how shall be understood what is being uttered?** Here the word *uttered* is used on purpose, as a term common to both the ecstasies of utterance in tongues and of prophesying, for utterance is inchoate speaking and speaking is utterance completed: incipient voice may become enunciated speech, as was the case in prophesying, or may not, as happened in glossolalia. *Easy of mark*, εὔσημον: 'easy to distinguish.'

*for ye shall speak into the air.*] A. V. not right: elliptical use of γάρ after interrogation: render, **Why!** unless the divine communications pass through the thinking faculty in order that they may be articulated by means of the *tongue* into sensible *speech* (λόγον, not 'words' as in A. V.), **ye will be all the while** (ἔσεσθε) **uttering** (chattering, talking) **to the air!** The air will be your audience, not men: ye will be ἀερόμυθοι (Philo).

10. Further correction of Corinthian tendencies to this interesting charism. Render:—**In any** assignable **number there are kinds of voices in the universe, and nothing** is there **without voice**—of some sort. More literally, **so many, perhaps**, i. e. an indefinite number left to be defined by the reader—say 10,000—*if that were to hit the mark*, εἰ τύχοι. This seems more correct than Meyer's explanation.

N.B. It is evident that φωναί here is akin in meaning to λαλίαι, a larger term comprehensive of it: for glossolalia is *voice*, not *speech:* it is here described as one of the many mysterious voices that fill the universe. This view is in harmony with what has been stated in v. 9 and is further aided by Plato's definition of φωνή or *voice*. With his definition it is curious to see how St. Paul's views in this chapter coincide. Plato says, '*Voice* is properly *inarticulate sound; when articulated*, it becomes *speech*:' λόγος γίγνεται ἡ φωνὴ ὅταν ὑπὸ τῆς γλώττης διαρθρωθῇ: compare with this v. 9 διὰ τῆς γλώσσης εὔσημον λόγον δοῦναι. Meyer and others cannot be right here in making φωναί = *languages;* an idea quite alien to the Apostle's line of thought, which still dwells upon glossolalia *inarticulate*, *unintelligible*, *unprofitable*. This idea of *languages* seems to be an *ignis fatuus* flashed from the 'speaking *barbarian*' of the next verse. For φωνή = *voice* see the Apocalypse *passim*.

Digitized by Google

none of them *is* without signification.

11 Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh *shall be* a barbarian unto me.

12 Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous [1]of spiritual *gifts*, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church.

[1] Gr. *of spirits.*

13 Wherefore let him that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue pray that he may interpret.

---

**And nothing is voiceless.** N.B. The A. V. cannot be right here: for οὐδέν does not refer to γένος or *kind* but means *nothing*, not used here absolutely but with some latitude. Connection of the argument in full: 'unknown and untold kinds of voices or inarticulate sounds are there in the universe; nothing without voice of some kind; animals have voices (φωνή is in classic writers used to denote *cries* of animals, *cries* of vendors of goods in streets, *cries* of rumour, Acts ii. 6, all manner of vague and indistinct cries); harps, flutes, trumpets have voices; all nature in her winds (John iii. 8) and seas and rivers has voices: everything has a voice *sui generis et suæ potestatis:* in God's universe how many *kinds of voices* there be, who knows? Τοσαῦτα, εἰ τύχοι—myriads of myriads: for creatures, as in the seen world, so in the unseen have voices: *spirits have voices*, but such voices as are not *speech* to men in the flesh, because they are not articulated by the human organ of speech. And what are your much-prized glossolaliae, O Corinthians, but spirit-voices, or utterances of a human spirit encompassed and interpenetrated and transfigured by the divine Spirit, utterances unutterable of an ecstatic adoration, which cannot employ the tongue as an instrument of their expression, cannot be formulated into human speech, cannot become signs of ideas to a congregation more interested or astonished than edified. The γένη φωνῶν must not be confounded with γένη γλωσσῶν.

11. Render:—**If therefore I do not know the force** or meaning **of the voice, I shall be to him who utters a foreigner and he who utters will, to my mind, be a foreigner.** Emphasis both times on the word *foreigner*, which is here used in Ovid's sense, *Barbarus* hic ego sum *quia non intelligor* ulli.

12. Application of the above analogies drawn from instruments of music and from the voices of the cosmos. Some members of the church in Corinth were eager aspirants (ζηλωταί) after the more dazzling charisms, especially the ecstasy of glossolalia; to this ambitious craving the Apostle allows free course, yet at the same time gives a right direction: let your aim be that ye be exuberant, that ye overlap one another in these gifts: certainly! nevertheless let your aspirations be guided by a due regard for the common welfare. If you should prefer glossolalia to prophesying, lose not sight of its proper complement, the gift of interpretation.

Render:—**On these grounds, inasmuch as ye are enthusiasts after spirits, do ye also aim** or **desire that for the edifying of the church ye abound.** Again definitive use of ἵνα; not, as Meyer and Alford, "seek them (no αὐτά) *that ye may* abound."

The word *spirits* here does not denote the "spiritual gifts" or the nine charisms of ch. xii. 9, but singles out one of them, or two at most, *utterance in tongues* and *prophesyings*, both of which in their local scene of operation were enthroned in the human shrinal spirit as possessed and controlled by the divine. For these two charisms were also two of the three forms of ecstasy. These two ecstasies, because they take effect in the human spirit, are therefore called simply *spirits*, whether spirits of men uttering in tongues without articulation and apart from speech proper, or of men distinctly enunciating divine revelations unto the edifying of the hearers. The rendering **spirits** seems to give the meaning correctly: some might prefer **spirit-powers**: certainly not "spiritual gifts." Πρός here = *with an eye to.*

13. Render:—**Wherefore,** if you wish to edify the church also, **let him who utters in a tongue pray that he be an interpreter.**

Two ways of taking this, (1) Let him, who possesses the gift of glossolalia before the ecstasy pray to God that during the ecstasy (or immediately after it?) he interpret what he utters: (2) Let him during the ecstasy so adore as to make intelligible the contents of his adoration, i. e. so pray that he interpret: compare "so run that ye overtake" ch. ix.

The objection to the first (made by Luther and by Meyer) that, in what sense the word *pray* is used in ver. 13 in that sense the same word must be used in v. 14 is futile, because the essential meaning is retained by the word in both verses, only the circumstantial sense differing. An exact parallel to this usage we have had in ch. x. 16, 17, where *the body of Christ* is followed in the next verse by the same word *body* applied to the Church in a

Digitized by Google

14 For if I pray in an *unknown* tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful.

15 What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.

16 Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?

17 For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.

18 I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all:

---

sense circumstantially different yet substantially the same. Moreover here after the second *pray* is added the explanatory *in a tongue*. In favour of (1) are Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact and others.

N.B. The Greek, however, is flexible to either view, for in (1) the ἵνα is purely *definitive*, with no mingled notion of half purpose (as sometimes stated in the critical notes of Ellicott and of Alford), but simply ushering in a definitive clause that specifies what are the contents of the general clause *let him pray*: comp. Joh. xiii. 34, "A new *commandment* give I unto you, *that* ye *love* one another," ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε. In the second explanation the ἵνα is used in the sense of *contemplated result*=let the ecstatic utterer, while he adores, turn a side-glance in the direction of interpretation. The difficulty lies not in the Greek, but in our own lack of experimental knowledge of these manifestations.

14. Reason assigned why the ecstatic utterer should pray for the gift of interpretation. Render:—**For if ever I pray in a tongue** (not *with my* tongue or organ of speech, but in a tongue not of this world), **my spirit prayeth, while my mind is** all the while **unfruitful.** How can it be otherwise, when all communications between the higher *pneuma* and the lower yet cognate *noûs* are during the ecstasy suspended and in abeyance? when the triumphant and rapt spirit soars beyond the grasp of the mental apprehension? when the activity of the self-consciousness is repressed by the divine seizure of the human pneuma? This divine influence takes complete possession of him who is uttering in the unintelligible tongue of a higher world: his *mind* not receiving cannot produce, cannot *bear fruit* in *thoughts* and *words* (for *logos* is engendered of *nous*); his sequestered adoration of prayer and of praise is edifying indeed to his own self gathered into his own spirit: *others* on the outside of himself it *cannot edify*, for the contents of his ecstatic adoration are not formulated into speech.

15. Render:—**What therefore ensues?** What is the result, if I pray to God that my ecstatic spirit be not so far entranced or ravished as to lose sight and let go of the thinking faculty but be permitted to retain in hold the mind as a receiver and reproducer?

Why, in that case, (render) **While I shall pray with the spirit, I shall pray with the mind also.** Clearly not, as A. V. and as many, "I *will* pray—*and*:" the objective *shall* is necessary to the right connection of the argument: the particles μέν and δέ also do not signify *and*, but denote different sides or aspects of the same proceeding. Render likewise the next clause:—**While I shall sing with the spirit, I shall sing with the mind also**: namely improvised psalms, which by the ecstatic were sung with his spirit.

16. The A. V. not quite right here: (εὐλογῇς is in *imperf.* subj. For its fuller sense see note ch. x. 16, ἐάν = *if ever* or *whenever*). Render:—**For else if ever** or *when* **thou art blessing** (God for His unspeakable *goodness* in the ecstasy) **in spirit, how shall one that occupies the place of a layman say the Amen after thine own giving of thanks** (for the divine εὖ experienced in the ecstasy), **seeing he knows not what thou art saying** all the time? How can he know what thou art saying to God, except thou sing forth thy spiritual praises through the mind formulating them into ideas, and with the tongue articulating the ideas into language?

*The Amen*: from the Jewish synagogue was derived to the Christian Church the time-hallowed usage of pronouncing the loud Amen at the close of a public prayer: it was an expression of assent to the contents of the prayer and a declaration of faith in its being heard by God. This custom here receives Apostolic confirmation. (For the sense of ἰδιώτης see notes on Acts iv. 13 and 2 Cor. xi. 6.)

17. Render, **For thou** (in thine own exalted sphere of the spirit) **givest thanks for grace beautifully**, splendidly, **but nevertheless the other** (the ungifted layman) **is not edified.**

18. *I thank my God, I speak with tongues.*

Digitized by Google

19 Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that *by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue.

20 Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be [1]men.

21 In the law it is [a]written, With

[1] Gr. *perfect*, or, *of a ripe age*.
[a] Is. 28. 11

---

*more than ye all.*] This version not quite right; here the style becomes abrupt and climactic: render, **I give thanks for grace** (in an ecstasy) **unto God—more than all of you do I utter in a tongue.** Clearly the verb *to give thanks* has in vv. 17 and 18 the same meaning, both essential and circumstantial.

**19.** Render:—**But nevertheless** (however self-edifying glossolalia may be to me in private) **in church I had rather give utterance to five words with my mind** (*noûs*), **that I may by speech instruct others also, than to ten thousand words in a tongue**—i. e. in a tongue not interpreted in speech articulated from mind informed by spirit.

N.B. Here λαλῆσαι = *to give utterance*, not *to utter*. Why the aorist? Because of the definite numbers of 5 and 10,000. The reason of the *rather* (which is omitted in the original as unnecessary) is, that the five words or λόγοι proceeding from the νοῦς, as with reflected consciousness it thinks in Greek, are all ideally intelligible and verbally expressible.

**20.** Hitherto St. Paul has been shewing how unedifying it is and useless to the Church, that a charismatic should in public utter in tongues without an interpreter, whether himself or another. He now, wishing to reduce the conceit of the Corinthians, appends a winning admonition. Render:—**Brethren** (a term of affectionate address), **prove ye not children in understanding, but in wickedness shew yourselves infants: in understanding prove ye adults.** The verb νηπιάζειν = *to play the infant:* comp. xiii. 11, "When I was an infant, as an infant did I talk, as an infant did I feel and think."

**21.** Connection of the argument. 'You may ask, O Corinthians, if the gift of glossolalia is to be thus restricted, what are *the tongues* for? Of what great use are they? My answer is, In private devotions this charism is for self-edification: in public, if it be accompanied with its proper complement of interpretation, it is for the edifying of the Church. These two uses I have already set forth at large: I am now going to show you another use of it: this glossolalia is given also *for a judicial sign to unbelievers.*'

This third use of the most striking of the charisms St. Paul now exhibits by taking a text from Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, where note the context of vv. 9, 10. Citing the passage from the Greek of the LXX, he recasts the words in a new form, and then stamps on the remoulded contents a new application. Under divine illumination he transfigures the prophecy, making the foreign-speaking Assyrian foreshadow the Corinthian utterer in tongues and the Hebrew scoffers of old prefigure the Hellenic unbelievers. It should be noted how he changes λαλήσουσι into λαλήσει. It is most likely that the phrase *shew yourselves infants* of v. 20 suggested this passage to the Apostle's mind because of the suitable context "line upon line—here a little, there a little"—God's own simple and initial instruction to a stolid and stubborn people, which elementary teaching the Jewish wise men of that day simply derided. Render: —**In the law** (i. e. in the Old Testament) **it is written, For with alien-tongued men and with lips of aliens shall I utter unto this people, and even then shall they not hearken unto me, saith the Lord.**

There are divers views of this text. At first sight it might be inferred from the phrase *alien-tongued men* or *heteroglotts* that "the tongues" in these Pauline chapters admit of being identified with *foreign languages*. This would not be correct: far from it: the two phrases *alien-tongued* and *talkers in strange tongues* are connected as type and antitype: nothing more. That which is common to the *barbarian language of the Assyrian* and to the *new tongues of the new creation* is the property of both being *unintelligible*. The Assyrian language was to the Israelite just what the strange tongues were to the Corinthian layman: both required an *interpreter*. This is the first analogue in St. Paul's curious adaptation of Isaiah's prophecy which had already been *historically* fulfilled. The second and more serious analogue is the *judicial sign*. This point requires care. Clearly, as the elementary "precept upon precept, here a little, there a little" was derided by the Jew, so the illogical chatterings of the new tongues were regarded as a raving and a ranting (v. 23) by the Greeks. In fact, the glossolalia is viewed by St. Paul as a *double* antitype: (1) *qua* unarticulated and fitful utterances of voices, it is an antitype of the inceptive "line upon line, here a little, there a little:" (2) *qua* its own undecipherable character, it is an antitype or

Digitized by Google

*men of* other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord.

22 Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying *serveth* not for them that believe not, but for them which believe.

23 If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there

---

the foreign language of the Assyrians. It is with the first of these two that the *judicial sign* has to do. For, as to the Hebrew scoffer the *contemned* "stammering lips" or rudimentary lessons were a sign of coming judgment, so to the Hellenic scoffer the *contemned* chatterings of the new tongues were a similar sign. Hence, to take the matter by the root, it appears that *sceptical scorn* it is both in Jew and Gentile that brings down the divine judgment. The glossolalia becomes to the *unbeliever* a sign: itself may vanish, but the sign abides: the sign is in store for the great day.

It should be noted that St. Paul *varies* from the LXX, when he makes *Jehovah himself* uttering by the organs of "alien-tongued men," i. e. (in the antitype) of "utterers in strange tongues." Why so? Because in the Apostle's mind ever dwells the idea that the *new tongues* are in their origin *divine*, communicated by the Holy Ghost to the impressible human spirit. Again, why his phrase "with *lips* of aliens:" Probably because in the ecstasy of glossolalia the lips were in motion, the tongue being in quiescence because the mind was in abeyance. For *no mind, no speech:* without νοῦς where is λόγος? Lips moved, strange voices were heard, not ordinary speech in the local language, unless indeed the utterer was also an interpreter. Hence Meyer is not right in supposing that in this ecstasy "the *physical tongue* was an organ of the Holy Ghost: unde et *nomen*."

22. Render:—**Accordingly** (i.e. in harmony with scripture) **the tongues are for a sign not to men who believe but to unbelievers, whereas prophesying**—is *vice versa*. The sense of this is plain. It should be noted that these *tongues*—which in so far as they found expression in uninterpreted voices were of the numberless *kinds of voices* (γένη φωνῶν v. 10), and comprised in themselves manifold *kinds of tongues* (γένη γλωσσῶν xii. 9), sometimes translated into human language, sometimes not—probably got their name of **the tongues** from the primal miraculous effusion on the day of Pentecost. The term is here plural in number, because the spirit-moulded tongue was plastic to the inbreathing of the divine communication: from the varied character of the revelations the varied voice of utterance or λαλία took its tone whether of continuity or of fitfulness or of other mysterious peculiarities.

23. Inference from the above axiom. Connection: what therefore, O Corinthians, will be the practical effects of that fascinating and overvalued glossolalia upon simple novices in the faith or upon heathen men, if such should happen to stroll into your church assembled in full? Will the plain layman be edified by your unintelligible utterances? And the heathen stranger—is he likely to be stricken with awe and converted to the faith by your incomprehensible chatterings? Nay, your unearthly voices he will identify with senseless jargon: he will say ye are raving, he will call you *ranters!*

In verses 23, 24, 25, the A. V. and other renderings, not marking the imperfect tense of two subjunctive moods, rather miss the full sense. It should be noted that ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό rendered *into one place* in the A. V. appears often to signify *for the same purpose;* here clearly for the *one object* of exercising the gift of glossolalia. This more correct rendering serves to elucidate the word *all* occurring four times in these verses, inasmuch as the *one* object, whether of uttering in tongues or of prophesying, is evidently correlated to the fourfold *all*, as well as to the word *whole*. The *all* or πάντες in each instance means not "all together," but "all in succession or one after another."

The general drift of these texts is to shew the superiority in usefulness of the intelligible prophesying to the incomprehensible glossolalia. Render, **If therefore the whole church be come together** (συνέλθῃ) **for the same object** (of uttering in tongues) **and, while all** (in succession) **are uttering in tongues, there should enter laymen or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are raving? Whereas** (δέ) **if, while all are prophesying, there should enter some unbeliever or layman, he is convinced by all** (as they announce one after another God's immediate revelations), **he is examined by all, the secrets of his heart come to the light, and so falling upon his face he shall worship God.** Some stress to be laid on the word *are uttering*, more on the word *are prophesying*. In the above verses the layman or *idiôtes* seems to connote also 'a weakling in the faith.' The verb *is examined* means in full, *he is sub-*

Digitized by Google

come in *those that are* unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

24 But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or *one* unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all:

25 And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on *his* face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth.

26 How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.

27 If any man speak in an *unknown* tongue, *let it be* by two, or at the most *by* three, and *that* by course; and let one interpret.

28 But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God.

---

*jected to a process of scrutiny in the court of conscience, he feels that the prophets are his grand jury and God his judge:* see on ἀνάκρισις, ch. ii. 14, 15. Grotius writes on the words *there should enter unbelievers,* "solebant enim pagani adire Christianorum ecclesias ad videnda quæ ibi agebantur." Observe, there is no inconsistency between what is here stated and the contents of ver. 22: the utterances in new tongues, howsoever raving or ranting they might seem to be, would nevertheless be to the *scoffing unbeliever* for a judicial sign.

In ver. 25 we have a vivid picture of that overmastering power, in its heart-searching and soul-reading effects, which marked the gift of prophesying. It comprised a keen perspicacity of a man's mode of life and character, a sure and certain intuition of his moral physiognomy; a divine power it was, filling and possessing the prophet, and from his spirit through mind, through tongue, flashing conviction on the hearer, lighting up the guilty deeps of the inner man, till the stricken sinner falls upon his face confessing aloud that God himself speaks in the speaking prophets.

**26.** Directions about the *orderly* exercise of spirit-gifts *in the church assemblies.* In this verse the Greek word (ἕκαστος), as elsewhere in this Epistle, means not "every one" (A. V.), but one or other in sequence, A and B and C, this and that man among the charismatics.

The verb *hath* also is used in the objective sense, 'has in store for others.' Paraphrase the whole, What therefore is the conclusion, brethren? Whenever ye come together—are assembling—one or other is ready with a psalm to improvise. is ready with a doctrine to expound, with a revelation to communicate, with a tongue for utterance, with an interpretation to append thereunto and to translate the utterance into Greek:—good! let all the gifts in their exercise proceed by all means with due regard to *edification.*

**27.** The above general direction formulated into special precepts in reference to the several grace-gifts. The sense is: 'if the exercise of glossolalia be the object of the gathering, let *two* or *three at the most* in one assembly utter in tongues, and then not together but in turn, one after another: moreover let one and no more than one interpret the contents of the several utterances.' Only one interpreter, probably to allow more time for the more useful prophetic and didactic addresses.

**28.** Render, **If however there be no interpreter, let him** (the ecstatic utterer) **be silent before the congregation: to himself only let him utter and to God.** The clause *if there be no interpreter* implies two possibilities (1) that the utterer cannot himself interpret, (2) that no one else gifted with interpretation is present. Under such circumstances the glossolalemata, not translated into Greek, would not be edifying to the Church: τὰ καινὰ γὰρ δεῖ ῥήμαθ' ἑρμηνευμάτων.

*To himself let him utter aloud and to God.*] i. e. in private, not in public, let him utter to himself, gathered into his own highest pneuma, and to God who meets him there in a sphere exalted above the *noûs* and its expression *logos.* As these utterances in tongues created of human spirit, possessed by the Holy Ghost, were utterances *audible,* now in loud and fitful voices, now in low and exquisite tones, the second δέ in this verse, which need not be rendered at all, has been rendered *only* rather than *however:* for this last rendering would imply that St. Paul permitted *glossolalia without interpretation* to be exercised in the presence of the assembled people. Of course, if this gift were thus exercised in public, the audible utterances would divert the attention of the congrega-

Digitized by Google

29 Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.

30 If *any thing* be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace.

31 For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.

32 And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.

33 For God is not *the author* of [1]confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.

34 Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the [a]law.

35 And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

[1] Gr. *tumult*, or, *unquietness*.

[a] Gen. 3. 16.

---

tion and create an interruption to proceedings which were to be conducted in orderly method and with an eye to edification.

29, 30. Render and explain, **Prophets likewise, let two or three** (in succession) **utter and let the others discriminate; yet if to another** (prophet) **seated a revelation be made, let the first** (prophet) **hold his peace.**

The general sense of this is plain, but our lack of experimental knowledge makes the inner meaning obscure. It is doubtful whether the explanation already given in ch. xii. 10 of the phrase "discernment of spirits" is correct. In the text before us *discriminate* may perhaps denote the gift of distinguishing whether the spirits of the prophets themselves are of a higher or lower order and stamp, for the divine communication in its power and in its kind varies with the varying human receptacle: as the vessel, so the contents.

*Seated* and listening to the inspired speaker in critical and diagnostic silence. A prophet speaking *stood*, Luke iv. 17.

*A revelation be made* seems to denote a new revelation superseding the one made to the first prophetic speaker, who on perceiving this is to hold his tongue. Meyer remarks *in loco*, "We see from this ver. 29 that the charisma of judging the spirits was joined with that of prophesying, so that whoever could himself speak prophetically was qualified also for *discrimination*."

31. The connection is: let the first prophetic speaker hold his peace: this he *can* easily do and take his turn again, when the interpellator, who will not speak too long, has ceased: breaks will occur: *all* the prophets will one after another have an opportunity of announcing the contents of their ecstasies, that *all* the *hearers* may be edified thereby. Emphasis on δύνασθε and on the triple πάντες.

Render:—**For it is in the power of you prophets all to prophesy, one by one, that all may learn and all may be heartened.**

32. Render:—**and** (besides) **spirits of prophets to prophets are under control.** This epigrammatic mode of speaking the Apostle prefers to the more ordinary *are under their own control*, not because it is more rhetorical and picturesque, but for a better reason, because while he writes or dictates the first half of the sentence his mind glances aside from "the prophets" to "the utterers in tongues," whose spirits in the ecstasy were *not* under the control of their will. Some emphasis therefore on the dative *to prophets*. Full sense is: to prophets their own spirits are under control, because they do not, like the spirits of utterers in tongues, soar aloft in the ecstasy beyond the grasp of the thinking and willing faculty. The mind, or seat of the will and of discursive thought, still retains its hold of the prophesying human spirit illuminated with divine revelations. If therefore the communications between *spirit* and *mind* and *speech* and *tongue* continue unimpaired, the prophet in the ecstasy, having full command of speech and tongue, can either hold his tongue or give speech. It should be noted, to make the logical connection clearer, that the καί (= "and besides") here places its own sentence in *co-ordination* with the preceding sentence, and introduces an additional reason why 'the first prophetic speaker' should find no difficulty in checking his discourse.

33. Summary reason, set as a crown on the precepts, why decorum and method should be observed in the exercise of gifts in the congregation. Render:—**For not** *on the side* **of disorder or tumult is God**, whose the Church is, **but** *on the side* **of peace.** God has nothing to do with irregularity. Precisely parallel is the construction of the genitive case in Gal. iii. 20, "A mediator has nothing to do with what is one," i.e. is out of place where duality is not.

34. How ambitious of publicity the Corinthian women were, how apt to assert equality of privileges with men, e. g. in discarding in church the veil or badge of subordination, is

Digitized by Google

36 What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?

37 If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.

38 But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.

39 Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.

40 Let all things be done decently and in order.

---

known from ch. xi. St. Paul here administers a summary rebuke to such frowardness. *Saith the law*, Gen. iii. 16.

36. Sudden lash of sarcasm. Render:—**What? from you was it that the word of God started, or unto you alone did it reach?** Is your Church the first and the last station on the line of the Gospel? Metaphor from the *stadium:* a favourite one with St. Paul. In LXX the word *καταντημα* means *a goal.*

Full sense: method, order, decorum should be observed in your assemblies; no irregularities, such as glossolalia apart from an interpreter in public, such as rival prophets declaiming two or three at once, such as women presuming to utter aloud in the congregation: all these anomalies must cease: *or* (the only possible alternative) are you Corinthians aspiring to take the initiative? Are you really the model and exemplar of all the churches? The Alpha and the Omega of Christendom? The *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* of the word of God?

37. After the sarcasm, gravity; serious assertion of apostolic authority; render:—**If anyone thinks that he is a prophet or spiritgifted** (a charismatic), **let him recognise that what I am writing is from the Lord.** N.B. Ἐπιγινωσκέτω, not here *know fully*, as in xiii. 12, but *recognise:* the essential sense is just the same in both passages; the circumstantial only varies.

38. Render:—**if however any one ignores** (the divine source of what I write), **let him ignore:** let him persist in refusing to recognise my high mission: he is irreclaimable: I relegate such a man to himself and to his own stolidity.

39. The flash of irony and the assertion of apostolic authority tone down into Christian tenderness expressed in the word *brethren.* Render, **Wherefore, brethren,** the sum of the matter is, **Aspire ye to the gift of prophesying; and the gift of uttering in tongues hinder ye not,** but let this less profitable endowment have free course within the prescribed limits: **only let all** the charismata in their public exercise **proceed in seemly manner and according to order;** i. e. let all the gifted utter and prophesy and teach within due bounds and in sequence meet, each at the right time and not too long.

---

## INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTER XV.

After his instructions on the right use of the spiritual gifts St. Paul proceeds to combat a more perilous heresy. The vices, rebuked in the earlier chapters, of sensuality, of covetousness, of arrogance, of insubordination, all these were *moral maladies* of limited mischief, affecting members here and members there: besides, however dangerous in themselves if not arrested in time, they were by comparison easy of healing. But this new form of evil was something more than a moral malady of local mischief: it was a *doctrinal gangrene* eating into the very core of the community and sapping the constitution of Christianity.

It appears that within tne pale of the Corinthian church there had arisen certain freethinkers of decidedly Gnostic tendencies. Self-confident and outspoken, as may be inferred from passages in this fifteenth chapter and in Clemens Romanus Ep. ad Corinthios, these ringleaders in neology had attracted and gathered around them from the four parties any one who was wise in his own conceits. These men, probably few in number and designated as "some among you" in *v.* 12, puffed up with what they called their *knowledge* (ch. viii.), had ventured to broach a baneful heresy to the effect that *a resurrection of dead men* is an

Digitized by Google

absurdity. 'Such a thing,' said they emphatically, '*non est! How*, we should like to know, by what process or in what manner are they raised—those dead? Again, with *what sort of body* do they come (v. 35)? If dead men are raised at all, and if being raised they shall come when the Lord comes, as this Apostle tells us, will they then come each with a body? If so, with a body of what sort, forsooth, will they come? A dead man's body buried moulders, rots, perishes: it is actually unified with the earth (ἑνοῦται τῇ γῇ): the animal organism is disintegrated in the dust, nay the very matter is dissolved: that which above ground was a body, in the grave *qua* body *non est*, and therefore a setting up from the grave (ἀνάστασις) of that which *non est*, is itself *nil*. Resurrection of men once dead? There's no such thing: all pious enthusiasm: flat against the laws of nature: χλευάζομεν δή: our sneer of doubting swells into the jeer of scouting.' And as the wisemen of Corinth did, so had the wisemen of Athens done just before them; "when they heard of a resurrection of dead persons, some jeered," Acts xvii. 32.

Analysis of the Argument. Chrysostom draws attention to the delicacy of tact with which St. Paul here handles his theme. No dogmatic reiteration of his own views, no reassertion of Apostolic authority. He begins by gently refreshing the memories of his hearers, making an appeal to their inner consciousness, their first conviction of the truth. This chord of subjectivity vibrates here and there through the first twenty verses.

The exordium is marked by courtesy and by terms carefully picked to avoid offence. "I now proceed to make better known to you," he quietly commences, "that evangel with which I once evangelized you." The substance of this evangel, he modestly implies, was not in any way of his own origination: it was drawn whole from a divine source. He himself was not much more than a human cistern continually being filled from the Fountain and continually overflowing unto others. He merely *delivered* (v. 3) what he had received. The gospel that he had preached in Corinth was a revelation made to the preacher. What was the substance of this gospel? The death and burial of Jesus Christ followed by the resurrection of the same. The certainty of this resurrection the writer makes more certain still, fortifying it in vv. 4–9 with a chain of ocular testimonies drawn out in chronological order. Moreover he reminds his readers that what he and others had once preached in Corinth, they themselves also had once believed, even when they were first converted (as they must well remember) and when they passed through the laver of baptism with their minds intent upon the two capital dogmas, the death of expiation for sin and the resurrection in His complete manhood of Jesus Christ: for these twin articles are the staple of the gospel and the ground of all faith.

'From whichever of us apostles' he proceeds in v. 11, 'whether from Paul or from Cephas, ye learned these cardinal truths, these correlative poles of doctrine upon which Christianity turns, *that* in itself is a thing quite immaterial: but let me draw your attention to the grave fact that as this teaching is still the basis of our preaching (κηρύσσομεν), so was it then the basis of your belief when ye first became believers (ἐπιστεύσατε).' Thus with a wise discretion, evincing his knowledge of human nature, he rolls back the memory of his converts on their former selves, back even to the tender time of their first faith, that they may recall to mind and 'inly ruminate' their earliest and strongest convictions.

Having stirred to its depths the consciousness of the Corinthian church he glides in v. 12 into his main task of refuting the thesis of the freethinkers. This he begins by asking, If Christ is *preached as one risen from the dead*, how is it that of a congregation listening to this doctrine *preached* certain members say, Resurrection of dead men—no such thing! Can you (he proceeds) believe this general assumption of theirs to be true? Impossible! for if it is true, it follows of course that *Christ also is not risen;* seeing that Christ not only became man, but also became a dead man.



Digitized by Google

*Si homines mortui non resurgunt*, then Christ, who as man died, was not as man raised, and if He is not raised, neither is He alive for evermore (ἐγήγερται). Thus the argument of these rationalists fails, as *proving too much*, for it proves that Christ Himself too is not risen: their theory is an absurdity. Moreover, in propounding such a monstrous thesis these persons give the lie to themselves: they gainsay their own professed views: for in denying the resurrection of dead men in the universal they deny, what they do not intend to deny, the resurrection of Christ in particular; for what is true of the class is true of the individual. In other words, these freethinkers allow *the firstfruits* but deny *the harvest*. Fools! for if they allow the first, they are bound to allow the second, and if they deny the second they are bound to deny the first. But they cannot deny what, logically speaking, they ought to deny, namely the resurrection of Jesus, because this is a fact well attested by many eyewitnesses, as was His crucifixion. These two solid facts are the pillars of our creed: they are the warp and woof of the gospel. In preaching *this* gospel we older Apostles, who with our eyes beheld the risen Christ, were all of one mind, and 'of one mouth.' Clear as day was our unity of teaching. And if *this* gospel is *preached* in Corinth, I ask how in the world can these persons, hearing it thus preached, with any consistency say, as by implication they do say when they maintain a non-resurrection of dead men, that the Incarnate Son of God is not *qua homo* risen? These wisemen with their εἰδέναι τὶ (ch. ii.), these 'knowsomethings' as they style themselves, while they think that they know something more than others are now shewn to know something less than themselves; for professing to accept the gospel, they unconsciously reject it when they deliberately reject the resurrection of dead men.

In vv. 17–19 St. Paul emphatically declares the fearful alternative that must ensue to the Church upon the truth of the hypothesis (logically deduced from the no-resurrection theory) that *Christ is not risen.* He then in v. 20 warily and in an easy manner, that takes for granted the unfaltering faith of his hearers in the article of Christ's resurrection, proceeds to shew dogmatically that the resurrection of Christ *involves that of all Christians:* that the two resurrections are separated merely by an interval of time that shall expire at the second coming. *But now, ye see—but as it is, ye know, Christ is absolutely risen from the dead.* Alone is He risen? Well, yes—for a season, but not for long alone, not unique, not an Alpha without a train of letters down to omega, not a μονογενὴς ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, but a πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. He is risen *the firstfruits of them that are fallen asleep.*

This doctrine that Christ is the firstfruits, and that, as the firstfruits, such is the harvest, leads the writer onward to contrast the two Humanities, the old and the new Creations, and then in swift succession to unfold marvellous revelations of things to come, passing even beyond the resurrection of the dead. His style now becomes grand and terse, a measured march of stately antitheses: he co-ordinates *homo* with *homo*, Christ with Adam. For according to St. Paul's view the Word of God took *the nature of all men*, died in that nature, in that nature was raised and remains risen, and that because the same nature which by death had been defeated must, according to the divine order, itself defeat death and triumph over it unto life.

It should be noted in this argument that from v. 20 the apostle suddenly passes into depths of doctrine far beyond the ken of Corinthian consciousness: that henceforth he makes few or no appeals to the knowledge of his readers, but proceeds to utter oracle upon oracle from his own intuition. On massive columns he rears a prodigious pile of thought, speaking after the manner of one prophesying and announcing the summary contents of some ecstatic vision. No doubt, from v. 22 to v. 29 we have the contents of one of St. Paul's superabundant revelations disclosing to our view a dim perspective of long Æonian reaches, extending from our Lord's resurrection

Digitized by Google

to His Parousia and stretching away beyond the Parousia over a period of conflict with spiritual principalities and dominions, which results in their complete subjugation and then ushers in the *telos* or end. In a few touches the prophet presents to the gaze of the Church outlines rising beyond outlines of a stupendous future—a vast sketch, and no more, that may be filled up in detail only when the Parousia shall belong to the Past and the *then* of apostolic presentiment shall become the *now* of Christian experience.

In v. 29 from his soarings into the divine future he brings his thoughts down to earthly things and back to the painful present. From the Church jubilant he returns *per saltum* to the Church militant. Like one awaking out of a vision he pauses a moment before he dictates to his amanuensis: *For else*—i. e. if all these revelations of the final triumph shall not be realised, as they shall not, if absolutely true is this new cry of no resurrection of the dead, I ask you what is to become in that case of all *who receive baptism on account of the dead*, when *of the dead* there is according to this new cry *no resurrection* at all? What shall they do but sink into despair? Again, if really there is no such thing as a raising of these dead, why on their account (ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν), why with a view to the resurrection of them do converts receive baptism at all? If the Resurrection is a vanity, the Sacrament becomes a mockery.

Notably abrupt is the transition from v. 28 to v. 29. This may be well accounted for by supposing (what seems probable from the grandeur and sublimity of the immediately preceding communications) that, like Moses descending from the Mount into the camp, the Apostle here descends in spirit from his lofty revelations to the business of his earthly charge. His thoughts return straight to the Church, to its two main divisions, Evangelists and converts: first of all to converts thus: *For else*, if Resurrection, which is the foundation of immortality, is itself a vanity and a nullity, what shall men do who in numbers receive baptism with an eye to the resurrection? What is the motive of these catechumens in passing through the laver? Again what is the moral mainspring of Evangelistic hardships? What is the reason why Apostles run hourly risks, why Paul dies daily deaths? The reason and the motives are not far to seek: it is because stayed upon the Resurrection is the hope of the baptised when they emerge from the hallowed streams, stayed upon the same anchor is the hope of Apostles when they face countless perils, and founded on the same rock is the faith of one who, being less than the least of all his colleagues, fought in Ephesus with the worst of all possible wild beasts, rational brutes in human form. The remainder of this chapter from v. 36 to the end belongs rather to commentary than to analysis.

## CHAPTER XV.

3 *By Christ's resurrection,* 12 *he proveth the necessity of our resurrection, against all such as deny the resurrection of the body.* 21 *The fruit,* 35 *and manner thereof,* 51 *and of the changing of them, that shall be found alive at the last day.*

MOREOVER, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand;

2 By which also ye are saved, if

CHAP. XV. 1. *Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you.*] Render vv. 1 and 2: **I now bring home to your knowledge, brethren, the Gospel which I preached unto you, which ye accepted also, in which ye stand firm also, by which ye are also being saved, if ye hold fast with what argument or discourse I preached the Gospel unto you, with (this) exception—unless ye believed at random** *or* **inconsiderately.**

The last clause that contains the exception means in full, *Unless ye embraced Christianity at a venture, without weighing well the*



Digitized by Google

ye [1]keep in memory [2]what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain.

3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

4 And that he was buried, and

[1] Or, *hold fast.*
[2] Gr. *by what speech.*

---

*reason why*. The whole of ver. 2 may be paraphrased thus, As long as ye retain the substance of my first preachings in Corinth, ye are on the highway to salvation, that is, if at your conversion your faith in Christ was built solid upon the firm ground of moral conviction and not laid light and easy on a fleeting enthusiasm or upon mere force of example or on a fitful admiration of the new religion.

The phrase *at random* or *inconsiderately* is a kind of key-note to the whole chapter. It is as a light straw indicating the direction of the writer's thoughts, shewing that the Apostle already contemplates with apprehension the shallowrootedness of his Corinthian converts and their unsteadiness in the foundations of the faith. His anxiety about their growing instability, lightly shadowed forth in this clause, reappears at the close of this chapter in the form of substantial advice, 'Wherefore prove ye stedfast, *unshifted*' i. e. unremoved from your safe anchorage in the article of the Resurrection.

*If ye hold fast with what argument I preached.*] i. e. 'if ye retain in your hearts and minds the *contents* of my preaching, how in my first sermons I exhibited the *argument of the cross* pure and simple, and how in my subsequent discourses I set before you the other grand *argument of the resurrection*. These two attested facts of inexorable logic I presented to you in plain language, bare of rhetoric. I did not then attempt, you may remember, albeit Christianity has a divine philosophy of its own so profound as to pass all soundings of human intellect, to propound a fine scheme of constructive philosophy in which the theory of the crucifixion might be inserted as a sun in a system of stars: that method of preaching may have been congenial to some of my rivals. Fresh from Athens, with some trembling I ventured in Corinth to confront the grandeur of Greek philosophy with the plain logic of *Christ nailed to the cross* and of *Christ risen from the dead*.' For this matter of St. Paul's preaching, see Introduction to this Epistle and notes on ch. ii. 3, 4.

*Are being saved* means 'are on the right way to the *Messianic salvation* ready to be revealed in the last time:' for which we pray in the versicle *And grant us thy salvation*.

*With an exception* (ἐκτός) is a generic term prefixed to the specific clause *unless &c.* in order to give the writer time to pause and frame the clause which formulates the exception. It might have been omitted as far as the sense goes: but its presence seems to denote deliberateness or solemn hesitation in the writer. N.B. Meyer is not correct in his explanation of ἐκτὸς εἰ μή: the μή is not redundant.

N.B. on εἰκῇ rendered *in vain* in the A. V. This word in classical Greek seems never to signify *in vain*, but always *at random*, *rashly*, *unadvisedly*, *at haphazard*, *without due reflection*, *without a settled plan or purpose*. Two instances of this certain use may suffice, Œdip. Tyr., 970, εἰκῇ κράτιστον ζῆν ὅπως δύναιτό τις, and Prom. Vinct. 450, ἔφυρον εἰκῇ πάντα. In the *Oratores Attici* we find more than once the phrase εἰκῇ καὶ ἀλογίστως ποιεῖν (Lysias περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ p. 109), which Cicero translates by *temere et nulla ratione* and *temere et inconsulto*. Compare also εἰκαῖος = *temerarius*. The meaning *in vain* seems quite foreign to the word. Neither in the Hellenistic of the N. Testament does εἰκῇ ever seem to signify *in vain* (μάτην): even in Gal. iii. 4, viewed in the light of the contextual words 'Ye irrational or inconsiderate Galatians,' it appears to denote 'without any assignable reason corresponding in weight and measure to what one has done or suffered': nor does the εἴ γε, rightly rendered, militate against this view. Chrysostom too uses the word in the sense of *unreasonably*.

It should be observed in ver. 2 that the last conditioning clause *unless ye believed heedlessly or without solid reason* covers the whole of the preceding sentence in both its clauses. It affects the apodosis *by which ye are being saved* taken in strict connection with its dependent protasis *if ye hold fast*.

*which ye also accepted.*] *Accepted* is perhaps better than *received* in the A. V. The παρά indeed is flexible to either meaning, but *accepted* is a word that brings the fact itself more home to the Corinthian consciousness. The same verb seems to mean *assumed* in Matt. xxiv. 40.

3. *For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received.*] *For*, i. e. in explanation of the contents of my preaching. Render—**For I delivered unto you in the foremost place what I also received.** Rather **what** than *that which*: for the clause is almost parenthetical.

*received.*] i. e. straight from the Lord by special revelation: ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου is ex-

Digitized by Google

that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures:

5 And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve:

6 After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.

---

pressed in ch. xi. 23. In *this* παρέλαβον the preposition is objective: not so in παρελάβετε of ver. 1.

*In the foremost place* means in the first ranks or foreground of my gospel, as cardinal points of doctrine. In the next sentence these two cardinal points, Christ's atoning death and resurrection, are specified.

*I delivered unto you principally, how that Christ died for our sins.*] *For our sins* means in full 'on account of our sins with a view to their expiation': by no means *in behalf of*, as some now explain, for how could Christ be said to die *in behalf of* our sins? In behalf of our *selves*, of our bodies and souls and spirits, He did die, but surely not in behalf of our *sins*. On this elastic use of the preposition see Additional Note at the end of this chapter.

*according to the scriptures.*] i. e. of the Old Testament. Why does St. Paul append this clause? Because in his time it was known to all that the man Jesus was slain on the cross, but it was known comparatively to few that the same Jesus was the predicted Messiah who thus died for the sins of mankind in fulfilment of the prophecies.

**4.** *And that he was buried.*] Why is the clause *according to the scriptures* omitted after the *burial* and expressed after the *death* and the *resurrection?* Because the burial is a natural consequence of the death and a pre-supposition of the resurrection: it lies between the two, a necessary link: it is not indeed unforetold (see Isaiah 53), but the Old Testament bears more marked witness to the death of Christ and to His resurrection, as being the two eyes in His work of redemption. Between these visible poles lies the connecting *burial:* beyond them lies on the lower side the descent into Hades, on the upper side the Ascension.

*and that he rose again on the third day.*] The Greek tense here requires that *rose again* be altered into *is risen.* Render with a break, **And that he is risen—on the third day.** In reciting this sentence a brief pause should be made after the word *risen.* No doubt St. Paul in dictating it made such a pause. For to utter in continuity or in one sustained breath such a proposition as *He is risen on the third day* would be an incongruity in terms. We do not, for instance, say *uno spiritu* 'I have seen the comet last night at eleven o'clock,' but 'I saw.' In fact, the definite time *on the third day* should properly be joined to a tense connoting a definite time, i. e. to an aorist, as is done in the Nicene Creed in an article based upon this text, *on the third day he rose again according to the scriptures.*

The perfect here indicates not a particular action of a definite time but a state continuing and abiding. *He is risen to die no more.* It is probable that St. Paul, after dictating the article *was buried*, rises with the coming thought into an exultant mood and exclaims in triumphant tones *and is risen!* In his emotion he soars above grammar and beyond the range of logic: he then with lowered voice adds the accurate afterthought *on the third day*, not caring to formulate the proper appendage *he was raised.* Chrysostom indeed on ver. 20 makes the Apostle, reverent and jubilant, bare his head and shout aloud, *Now is Christ risen from the dead!*

**5.** *And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve.*] Render: **And that he appeared to Cephas, after that to the twelve.** A matter of such moment and a fact not easy of credence demanded a host of witnesses: Grotius. *To Cephas*, see Luke xxiv. 34. *To the twelve.* See John xx. 19–34 and Introduction to 1 Peter. After the death of the traitor only eleven remained: Thomas too was absent at this appearance. In fact, the number *twelve* is here an official designation, used in the same way as *decemviri* and *centumviri* among the Romans.

**6.** *After that he was seen of above five hundred.*] Render, **Next after that** (ἔπειτα, not εἶτα) **he appeared to upwards of five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, though some fell asleep** (when they did fall asleep).

When and where this simultaneous manifestation to so many spectators occurred, whether in Galilee, as some think, or in Jerusalem as others, is nowhere recorded. Probably, however, it occurred in Galilee: see notes on Matt. xxviii. 16. But, as Theodoret remarks, the testimony of such a multitude of eye-witnesses on one occasion (ἐφάπαξ) places the fact of our Lord's Resurrection beyond suspicion. It should be remembered that this long-drawn argument of ocular testimony is addressed by St. Paul to the Church in Corinth, as a preliminary basis for reducing to silence the new cry of *no resurrection.* The under-

Digitized by Google

7 After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles.

8 And last of all he was seen of me also, as of [1]one born out of due time.

9 For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.

10 But by the grace of God I am

[1] Or, *an abortive.*

---

thought of the writer is, If it is a fact that *Christ is risen*, your new cry that *dead men are not raised* is at once extinguished: but that *Christ is risen* is a fact that may be amply substantiated, for of His bodily appearance after the crucifixion I have many eyewitnesses still living:' these eyewitnesses are producible.

The last clause of this verse, ushered in by δέ = *though* or *albeit*, is a subordinate clause.

**7.** *After that, he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles.*] Render **Next after that he appeared to James; next after that to the apostles all.** Again ἔπειτα = *next in order*, not *after that* as in the A. V. This distinction is important in vv. 23, 24.

The several words denoting 'sequence' in these verses, *afterwards*, *next in order*, *last of all*, make it highly probable that these appearances of our Lord are set in chronological order. The two appearances specified in ver. 7 are unrecorded elsewhere, and otherwise unknown. Certainly in the first is meant James the Just, called in Gal. i. 19 'the brother of the Lord.' In the last clause the emphasis is rather on the word *apostles* than on *all*.

**8.** *And last of all he was seen of me also as of one born out of due time.*] The A. V. not quite right here: render and explain, **Last of all, however, just as if** (he was appearing) **to the abortive one** (of the Apostolic family) **he appeared also to me.**

In the Greek the word *to me* is placed last with the emphasis of genuine humility. The same pathetic emphasis accentuates the initial *I* of the next verse.

The right explanation of this text seems to be this. St. Paul is stating not the point of view from which he regards himself, *this* he does in the next verse, but the point of view from which he conceives that the Lord may have regarded him. He supposes that Christ in His circuit of calling men to the Apostolate appeared to him near Damascus *last, as deeming* him, the persecutor of the Church, the least worthy.

N.B. The rendering *as to the abortive one* would require other Greek, ὡς (ὄντι) τῷ ἐκτρώματι. After the εἰ in ὡσπερεί should be supplied something like ἔμελλεν ὀφθῆναι or ἑωρᾶτο. Ὡσπερεί occurs nowhere else in N.T. Its use is more subjective than that of ὥσπερ. If this explanation of ὡσπερεί is correct, the ordinary view of this verse is inaccurate, namely 'ut abortivus non est dignus humano nomine, sic *apostolus negat* se dignum apostoli nomine; Bengel.

*last of all.*] A.V. quite right=that is, *the last of all the appearances.* (Πάντων is neuter: Meyer makes it *masculine*, referring it to the Apostles and rendering *of them all.* The Greek for that idea would rather be ἐσχάτῳ αὐτῶν πάντων, see v. 10, or τῶν πάντων.)

**9.** St. Paul, having just stated what he conceives that the Lord must have thought of him, now proceeds to state what he thinks of himself.

**10.** *But by the grace of God I am, &c.*] This verse should be taken in strict connexion with the preceding one, which indeed it modifies and illustrates, placing it in its true light. (The rendering of the A. V. is not happy here, misled in part by a reading not genuine, ἡ before σύν. The first δέ is corrective =*yet*, not adversative = *but*, as in the A.V.)

Render the whole verse and explain in connection with the preceding one, Not meet to be called Apostle am I, not worthy in myself of that honourable name, **yet by the grace of God I am what I am** (a hard-working Apostle), **and his grace which reached unto me** (*me* emphatic) **proved not ineffectual, but** (on the contrary) **more abundantly than they all did I work hard, yet not I, but the grace of God** (did work along) **with me.** Emphasis strong on the last *me:* not '*with* me,' but 'with *me*,' i.e. *in combination with myself.* The grace of God and the concurrent will of His Apostle are two coefficients in evangelistic labour. Augustine takes the right view of this passage, who saw that the last word *me* was to be accentuated: this is plain from his writing *cum illo*, not *cum eo* in his comment; Non ego autem, i.e. non solus, sed gratia Dei mecum: ac per hoc nec gratia sola nec ipse solus, sed gratia cum *illo*.

Some moderns explain this verse, as if "divine power wrought with St. Paul in such overwhelming measure, that his Apostolic labour was no longer his own work, but all of God's grace." But this view cannot fairly be extracted from the text rightly rendered. Rather must we infer that God, knowing the hearts of men, gives His grace

Digitized by Google

what I am: and his grace which *was bestowed* upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.

11 Therefore whether *it were* I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed.

12 Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?

13 But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen:

14 And if Christ be not risen,

---

to all whom He sees to be receptive of it: and to such as use it well, He gives it in larger measure. The more work done, the more grace given. In fact, there is a mutual interaction between God's grace and man's use of it, just as there is between the rain of heaven and the mists of earth. These two kindred moistures produce and reproduce one another: when rich rain falls upon soft ground, in due time a grateful mist rises and makes fresh clouds: these again break in fresh rain. St. Paul states that God's grace in his own case did not prove ineffectual, because it was not allowed by himself to lie idle. By its aid and co-operation he toiled and moiled in excess of all the other Apostles.

11. *Therefore whether it were I or they.*] Rather, perhaps, **Whether, however, it be I or they,** i.e. the other Apostles.

The words convey a side-glance at those in Corinth who called in question St. Paul's apostolic rank. Full sense is: it is a matter of little moment whether Paul or Cephas are the preachers, so long as the true doctrines are proclaimed. At all events, it is certain that *we* do preach them, and it is certain that *ye* did believe them, when at your conversion ye believed with the heart and in your baptism ye confessed with the mouth that the same Jesus, who died for our sins, is risen from the dead. His cross and His resurrection are still the sum and substance of our preaching and were then the contents of your faith.

*Critical note.* The οὖν hardly resumes the thread of the discourse from v. 8, as Meyer thinks: the distance is too great. Here it seems to signify *however* or *at all events.* This particle is always retrospective, and generally serves to draw an inference and is then rendered *therefore* or *consequently.* But sometimes it is used in *summing up* or in *settling a question* with a backward glance at some acknowledged fact. Then it appears to mean *in fact however* or *at any rate* or *the truth of the matter is* or simply *in fact*, as in Æsch. Coeph. 874. δόλοις ὀλούμεθ', ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκτείναμεν: in this line it cannot mean *consequently.* Neither in the text before us can it well have this meaning, for there is not a peg near enough on which to hang the *consequence*: a big ellipse would have to be inserted.

12. *Now if Christ be preached that he rose.*] Render **is preached that from the dead he is risen.** Emphasis on the word *Christ;* for *His* resurrection, a fact well attested by hundreds of eyewitnesses, forms the basis of the argument by which St. Paul makes absurd the new thesis, 'there is no resurrection of dead men at all.'

It should be observed that the Apostle does not say here 'if Christ *is risen*' (*that* has been abundantly proved), but 'if Christ is *preached as risen.*' The connexion of this verse with the preceding clearly is: Christ risen from the dead we Apostles still preach: now if this doctrine is still preached in Corinth, how in the world comes it to pass that some among you affirm so and so. Really I am quite at a loss to understand how it happens that in a church, where this acknowledged fact is proclaimed, certain persons (who shall be nameless) *hearing* this fact proclaimed, namely that there is confessedly one man who died and was raised, nevertheless dare to moot the proposition that no man who has once died is ever raised. This proposition denies by implication and *per consequentiam* the resurrection of Christ himself.

13. Render and explain—**But** (this proposition of theirs stands out more glaring in its absurdity, for) **if there is no resurrection of dead men** (it follows that) **Christ also is not risen, or neither is Christ risen.** *Sublato genere tollitur et species*, Grotius: Christ is here the *species* of the *genus.*

*Critical note.* The right meaning of οὐδέ here is *also not* or *neither* in the sense of *no more.* Some render it *not even*: but that meaning just breaks the line of the argument. St. Paul's argument clearly places Christ in the category of human beings, and the drift of it is this: If this proposition be true of all human beings that ἅπαξ θανόντος οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις, it follows of course that Christ too, an individual of the class, never left the tomb: therefore He is *not* 'risen to die no more' (ἐγήγερται).

14. Render, **But if Christ is not risen**

Digitized by Google

then *is* our preaching vain, and your faith *is* also vain.

15 Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.

16 For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised:

17 And if Christ be not raised, your faith *is* vain; ye are yet in your sins.

18 Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.

19 If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.

20 But now is Christ risen from

---

(emphasis on the *not*), **void then is our preaching also, void is your faith also.**

Connexion and expansion; If true be the proposition of these sciolists or self-styled 'knowsomethings,' its logical inference is inexorable—*Christ is not risen.* But the consequences to us and to you of this necessary inference are terrible to contemplate; for *in that case* (ἄρα) the substance of our preaching likewise and the contents of your believing likewise are all hollownesses—vanities ventilated for a season. These floating bubbles, suddenly pricked by this new philosophy, melt into air. For if you remove the resurrection, immediately one of the two pillars that support the archway of the *evangel* falls, and with it the whole fabric falls: Christianity, no longer resting on the resurrection, collapses, although its other pillar of the crucifixion may be left standing in monumental solitude.

**15.** *Yea and we are found false witnesses of God.*] This forms another link in the long chain of inferences that may be logically drawn from the first necessary inference *Christ too is not risen* of the preposterous thesis *Resurrection of dead men is a mere chimera.*

*Whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.*] The A.V. not quite right here. Render **whom he did not raise** (emphasis on the *not*), **if indeed after all dead men are not raised** (emphasis again on the *not*). The reasoning much the same as before: Christ became a *dead man* and, as such, He was *not* raised by God, if it be true that *dead men* universally are not raised by God.

*Critical Note.* Ἐγείρονται here is evidently *passive*, not *middle* as in the A.V. This is clear both from the immediate context of ἤγειρεν and from the use of the verb elsewhere. The ἄρα seems to mean *as they say*, i.e. according to the view of these scientists.

**16.** The A.V. not quite right. Render, **For if dead men are not raised, neither is Christ risen.** Solemn repetition in substance of ver. 13, made partly in proof of the last statement in the foregoing verse, partly as a firm basis of new inferences more startling still and more disastrous than ever.

**17.** *And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.*] Rather **But if Christ is not risen** (emphasis on the *not*), **idle is your faith; ye are still in your sins.** Connection and expansion: for if this startling theory of theirs be verified and if *per consequentiam* the non-resurrection of Christ be established, what becomes of you believers? This: your faith is proved spurious and futile, its substance a mere castle in the air: your bodies and souls and spirits are unredeemed: if Christ is still in the grave, ye are still in your sins: most certainly ye are, if it be no more than a beautiful dream that *he was raised for our justification.*

**18.** *Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.*] Rather, **So then, they also which fell asleep in Christ perished!**

A gleam of serious irony or indignant sarcasm seems to run through this verse This appears from the form in which the thought is expressed, the form of an *oxymoron* or epigrammatic contrast. St. Paul does not say *they which died* or *went the way of all flesh*, but *they which were laid asleep in Christ.* How can any one seriously be said *to fall asleep in Christ* and at the same time *to perish?* A contradiction in terms: *they* perish or go to perdition who die outside of Christ, not they who fall asleep in Him. The particle ἄρα = *so then* is a suitable verger to irony.

**19.** *If in this life only we have hope in Christ.*] Rather, **If only in this life we have set our hopes upon Christ.** The word *only* affects the whole clause from *in* to *Christ*, uttered *uno spiritu.* In the Greek it is placed last, the sense being, 'If in this life we are hopers in Christ *and nothing more*,' i.e. with no possible future before us of His beatific vision and of God's immortality and kingdom and glory.

*we are of all men most miserable.*] According to the Greek *more miserable* or *pitiable*

Digitized by Google

the dead, *and* become the firstfruits of them that slept.

21 For since by man *came* death, by man *came* also the resurrection of the dead.

22 For as in Adam all die, even

---

*than all men are we:* the sense being, we Christians are more real objects of pity than the heathen, who constitute the mass of mankind. *Miserable* means not 'wretched' (*miseri*) but 'meet for compassion,' 'objects of *mercy:*' compare the prayer in the Litany, 'have *mercy* upon us, *miserable* sinners.'

Perhaps this verse may be better rendered, **If in this life we have set our hopes upon Christ, only that, most miserable of all men are we.**

**20.** A new phase in this chapter now presents itself. The style with the theme changes: lofty dogmatic statement supersedes vehement argument: the logician becomes the prophet. Hitherto St. Paul has written level to the inner consciousness of his readers: he now rises to planes exalted far above their Christian knowledge, and discloses to their view a long perspective of a divine future, the contents of revelations made to himself. The inspired Apostle dictates oracles: the Resurrection and the Parousia are but the imposing vestibule of the Messianic Aeon, that age of all the ages: see on these points *Introduction to this Chapter.*

The contrast between the first and second sections will be made more apparent by a brief résumé. In the foregoing verses St. Paul has demolished the new theory *no resurrection at all of dead men* by shewing that the argument fails as *proving too much*, proving even more than its own advocates may have intended: for carried out to its fair issues it proves that *Christ also is not risen:* but this result, however true in logic, is not true in fact, for that *He* should not be risen is a thing absolutely incredible, seeing that after His own resurrection He appeared bodily to hundreds of eyewitnesses, most of whom are still alive and therefore producible. One of these eyewitnesses is the writer himself. St. Paul has moreover enforced his own logical refutation of the new thesis by a stirring appeal to the *moral sense* of his readers, picturing in a few touches a terrible alternative. If this startling theory should after all (ἄρα) be correct, what then? calamitous consequences; we are still in our sins; we are on the way to perdition! This cloud of gloom the apostle in v. 20 removes, letting in the sunshine of truth. He makes an easy and triumphant transition from melancholy possibilities to the one joyous reality, the incontestable fact of Christ's resurrection. No wonder Chrysostom makes St. Paul in this verse shout jubilantly the key-note of the chapter *Christ is risen from the dead!*

*But now.*] *Now* used in logical sense = *now, you know.* The words *and become* should be omitted, and *that slept* is wrong. Render, **But, as it is, Christ is risen from the dead, firstfruits of them that are fallen asleep**: more exactly *of the fallen asleep*, i. e. of all departed saints from Adam to the Advent. The writer's mind leaps forward to the Parousia, and glances back through the ages. This may be inferred both from the phrase *fallen asleep*, which in the New Testament denotes the death of the saints, and from the fellowship of *all* believers with Christ as implied in the word *first fruits.*

Underlying the dogmatic statement of this verse is another argument for the general resurrection aimed at the freethinkers. For it may be asked, Why is Christ risen from the dead? For His own sake? Not so, but for the sake of His brethren and of mankind, that these too may be raised at their proper times. He is the firstfruits—of a *harvest*, and as surely as the harvest follows the firstfruits, so surely shall all they who die in the Lord be raised just as *He* was raised who died for them. He is the one true Paschal Sheaf that hallows and ensures the many after-sheaves, the earnest and guarantee of the final ingathering of His elect: these too, when risen, shall "be like Him," for they shall be reaped from the same field: *as* the firstfruits, *so* the harvest. The above view does not exclude the fact that Christ shall raise *unbelievers* also, only that He is not *their* firstfruits: they too shall be reaped, but not from the same field.

**21.** *For since by man came death.*] Rather **since through man is death, through man is resurrection of dead men.** Here the statement of the previous verse is made to rest upon a divine arrangement and principle, namely, In what nature defeat has been sustained, in the same nature conquest must be achieved: if *homo* put on trial has lost immortality placed within his reach, *homo* again put on trial must win back immortality. The conclusion is, says Meyer, *a causa mali effectus ad similem causam contrarii effectus. Death* here is *physical*, the result of moral and spiritual death.

*Through* or *by means of man:* διά, not ἐξ ἀνθρώπου. Why so? Because mortality came by means of Adam from the Tempter as from the source of evil, for "by envy of

Digitized by Google

so in Christ shall all be made alive.

23 But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.

24 Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom

---

the devil sin entered into the cosmos," Wisdom of Solomon ii. 24. In like manner immortality is *through* Christ as the mediating cause but *from* God as the efficient cause, who is the only source of only good. *Man* in his nature is here described as the instrumental cause both of *man's death* and of *man's resurrection*.

**22.** *For as in Adam all die.*] Rather **in the Adam** and **in the Christ**. The abstract ideas of the previous verse now reappear in concrete form: *man* becomes *the Adam*, *man* again *the Christ: death* becomes *all men dead*, *resurrection* becomes *all men made alive*.

*all shall be made alive.*] i. e. in the Christ all men without exception, both believers and unbelievers, shall be raised bodily. Nevertheless they shall not all be raised together, not all mankind in one massed army but in several divisions and at distinct epochs. This idea, not discernible in this text, comes to view in the next. It may be remarked that, divorced from its context, this passage wears on its surface a hope of universal salvation in the end: but in the next verse this gleam disappears before the corrective δέ and the dissective ἕκαστος. In fact, a *comma* or *semicolon* should be placed after *made alive*.

**23.** Connect and render; All shall be made alive, **every one, however, in his own division** or **class**, as **firstfruits CHRIST, next in order they that are Christ's in his coming; afterward the end.** The word *every one* individualises and the phrase *in his own division* classifies the undistinguishable *all* of v. 22.

*In his own order* of the A. V. is not correct according to the modern sense of the word 'order.' If St. Paul, like Polybius and Xenophon, uses τάγμα here in the sense of *legion* or *brigade*, the image becomes military. The whole human race, like one army, defiles before us in three divisions separated from each other by long intervals. The Lord Himself constitutes the first division: He is four times in the New Testament designated our Commander-in-chief (ἀρχηγός, compare ἀπαρχή): as the *Archegus* or Foremost Leader, He is already nearly two millenniums in advance of His own battalion, the next division of the resurrection, the Church of the Redeemed. The rest of mankind constitute the third and largest division: an interval of unknown duration separates the second from the third.

*At his coming* or *parousia.*] Rather perhaps *in* than *at*. The phrase seems to denote within the saving circle of His Advent, when He comes terrible to His enemies, environed with a margin of 'flaming fire that shall devour the adversaries.'

*Critical note. Afterward* of the A. V. might be replaced by *next in order* or *next after that*': compare τί πρῶτον; τί δ' ἔπειτα; not to mention the word's etymon. A *semicolon* should be placed at the end of this verse.

**24.** *Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God . . .*] Render, **afterward the end, whenever he delivereth the kingdom** or **kingship to God the Father.**

What *the end* here may signify, cannot be determined: *alii alia:* in all likelihood 'the end' is its own interpreter. Two things seem clear from the tenses in this verse, (1) the end or *terminus ad quem* will then be, *whenever* the Son shall make to the Father a transfer of the regal office and government; (2) that this transfer will be made *not before* the disablement of all hostile powers, but *after it*. No doubt, the intuition of the inspired apostle enables him to glance beyond the grand epoch of the Advent and to discern dimly on the other side of it a period of conflict with a succession of evil dominations, angelic and human, *the high ones that are on high and the kings of the earth upon the earth:* Isaiah xxiv. 21. How long this period of conflict may last, is left undetermined in this verse: but it will cease as soon as Christ has dispotentiated or made ineffectual (καταργήσῃ) all that exalts itself against God. This final subjugation will be followed by the formal abdication: since this aim and end, this *terminus ad quem* of the mediatorial regency being accomplished, the resignation thereof will take place. Hence it seems probable that the *kingship* (βασιλεία) will be handed over by the Incarnate Son to Him who is God and Father (τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί); but the *kingdom* of His own founding, in its contents of citizens, the πολίτευμα of Philipp. iii. 20, will continue: so that *His kingdom shall have no end;* Nicene Creed.

*Critical Note.* The *apodosis* here, τὸ τέλος (ἔσται), has two *protases*. The second ὅταν clause is in its contents subordinate and in its time anterior to the first ὅταν clause: this is clear from the aorist καταργήσῃ. The subject to καταργήσῃ is *Christ*.

Digitized by Google

to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.

25 For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

26 The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed *is* death.

27 For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under *him*, *it is* manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.

28 And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son

---

**25.** *For he must reign.*] i. e. *remain king.* The imperf. infinitive shews that the mediatorial sovereignty lasts without intermission till the subjection of all enemies be a fact accomplished. *Must* is most emphatic: it denotes the *divine appointment:* the government of the Universe with all the ruling powers therein, entrusted by the Father to the Son from the Ascension to the Advent and from the Advent to the final Subjugation, is an essential part of God's eternal counsel of good (εὐδοκίας).

**26.** *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*] Rather *that* **is brought to nought:** present tense of a dateless event that is sure to happen. Death is here personified: so Rev. xx. 14.

**27.** *For he hath put all things.*] Proof that death too shall be incapacitated. The point of the proof lies in the emphatic *all things,* which *includes death.* A colon should be placed after v. 26. This verse may be rendered, **for all things did he subject** (or **set**) **under his feet: but when he** (the Father) **shall say All things are now subjected** (or **are in subjection**), **manifestly** it will be **with exception of him** (the Father) **who subjected the all to him** (the Son).

*All things did he* (God) *set under his* (Christ's) *feet.*] Citation from Ps. viii. The aorist points to a time 'before all worlds' in the divine counsel of redemption. *All things* comprehends the universe of worlds material and spiritual, with their manifold populations of angels, of men, of demons, Satan and Death included. All creations without exception shall be reduced to complete subordination, voluntary in some, in others compulsory.

*Critical Note. When he shall say,* ὅταν εἴπῃ: this seems at first sight to be the right rendering, yet the A. V. may be correct after all: see in Chrysostom *passim* ὅταν λέγῃ and ὅταν εἴπῃ=*when he saith.* If the rendering *shall say,* i. e. in the time of the *telos,* be right, the ellipse to be supplied after δῆλον ὅτι will be πάντα ὑποτετάξεται; not, as Meyer, πάντα ὑποτέτακται.

**28.** *And when all things shall be subdued unto him.*] Render, **When, however, the all shall have been subjected to him** (the Son), **then shall the Son himself also be subjected to him** (the Father) **who subjected the all to him** (the Son) **that God may be all in all:** that is, *that God may be all relations in all creations,* all relations that subsist between the Governor and the governed: the homage, whether it be voluntary or compulsory, shall be universal.

That the abdication of the throne and the subordination of the Son to the Father will be *voluntary* acts may be well inferred from other texts, but hardly from this. Bengel makes αὐτός=*of himself, ultro:* but the καί, if the right reading, is against that. The passive voice too *shall be subordinated* shews that the objective fact is here declared, and nothing more.

This objective fact is that, the aim and end of His kingly administration being accomplished, the Godman transfers from Himself to God alone the supreme sovereignty of all creations both human and superhuman now brought into complete subordination. This act of transference is the last duty of His mediatorial office. The Father now assumes the supreme government thereby fulfilling the second petition in the Lord's Prayer.

The term *God* in the last clause may denote the Tripersonal Deity, which "before all worlds" concurred in the counsel of redemption and of creation: the term *Father* is omitted after it, and the prefix of the Greek article scarcely invalidates this view. It may be added that after his abdication the Eternal Word or Unique Son of God still retains that essential royalty (βασιλεία) which is inalienable from Deity. But beyond question the whole of this passage is a grand summary of sublime mysteries, which their own fulfilment in eternity alone can solve. It is from the contemplation of this stupendous future—namely all saints risen, all men risen, all rebels quelled, the Triune God fulfilling all possible relations in all actual creations—that the Apostle in the next verse, like one breaking from a reverie, descends to the painful present, and descends with an abruptness that must have startled his amanuensis.

Suddenly from the triumphant *telos* his thoughts return to the church still militant upon earth, (1) to *converts* that are ever

Digitized by Google

also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

29 Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?

30 And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?

31 I protest by [1]your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily.

32 If [2]after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus,

[1] Some read, *our*.

[2] Or, to speak *after the manner of men*.

---

being enrolled in its ranks by baptism (βαπτιζόμενοι, *imperfect* participle, denoting a constant series of candidates), (2) to *Apostles* who in the front and post of danger are daily and hourly brought face to face with death.

**29.** *Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead?*] The prophet again becomes the reasoner the tone is now vehement, impassioned, indignant. **Since else**: elliptical use of *for* or *since*. The ellipse, as usual, is to be gathered from the foregoing context, and is as follows: Otherwise—if *such* a future should be made void by *such* a theory, if the triumphant issues of Christ's redemption and regency are a vanity, and they *are* a vanity, if resurrection, their basement and foundation, is a vanity; I ask you, if true is the alternative of these freethinkers that the dead are *not* raised, **what shall they do which receive baptism on account of the dead?** i.e. *with a view to the resurrection of the dead?* The sense in full is: what course shall converts now pursue, who passing through the laver rise out of the water with hearts believing and mouths confessing that the dead shall rise? If your freethinkers close the very gate of God's Kingdom, as they do close it, when they deny the resurrection of dead men in the body if not in the soul and spirit also, what in that case are miserable catecumens to do? What course shall they pursue (τί ποιήσουσιν, not exactly 'what is to become of them)? They will be at their wit's end, not knowing what to do. To this effect in substance are the comments of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret and of many early fathers. From the ancient expositors most of the modern differ.

N.B. It should be noted that the word here rendered *receive baptism* is in the middle voice: it is also the participle imperfect: the imperfect here denotes a *series* of catechumens receiving baptism: this series goes on and on and is in its *process* imperfect. Alford's rendering *those who are in the habit of being baptized in behalf of the dead* is wrong in three particulars. Meyer's rendering too, *persons who have themselves baptized*, is against the use of the middle voice, and his further view *for the benefit of people who have died unbaptized* is as untenable as it is gratuitous and irrelevant. But on this controverted text see Additional Note at the end of this chapter.

*if the dead rise not at all, why are they then baptized for the dead?*] Render; **If absolutely not raised are dead men, why do persons actually receive baptism on their account?** *On their account*, i.e. in sure and certain hope of their being raised at the last day: in other words, *if resurrection is null, the sacrament is void:* if the first is a myth, the second is a farce.

**30.** *And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?*] Rather, **Why are we also in jeopardy every hour?** *We also*, i.e. Apostles: we Apostles too, as well as catechumens, are stirred by the hope of resurrection: for if men after death are *not* raised, why do *catechumens* receive baptism, and why do *we* run risks? The words *every hour* are a quick after-thought: *run risks—every hour.*

**31.** *I protest by your rejoicing—I die daily.*] Render: **Day by day do I die, yea by the glorying in you, brethren, which I hold in Christ Jesus our Lord.** Full sense, 'Day by day I am brought face to face with death; I affirm it by the future *occasion of glorying on your account, which* I now have safe in (the keeping of) Jesus the Anointed King, to whom belongs all power in heaven and earth.'

Our Lord's name and titles in full; for it is He who on His return shall recompense His faithful servants and award to St. Paul for his labours in Corinth the στέφανον καυχήσεως, 1 Thess. ii. 19. *Yea* (νή), a particle of *affirmation*, not (as some) of adjuration. Ἔχω here does not mean *I have* in the sense of *I feel*, but *I possess:* this possession becomes objective in the custody of Jesus Christ.

**32.** *If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?*] Render, **If in a man's fashion I became a beast-fighter in Ephesus, what to me the advantage, if dead men are not raised?** Emphasis on the not. Probably the punctuation of the A.V. should be retained here, the obvious ellipse after *what the advantage to me* being *none at all*, if dead persons are *not* raised after all!

Digitized by Google

what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to morrow we die.

33 Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.

34 Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak *this* to your shame.

35 But some *man* will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?

---

*I became* or *turned beastfighter*, a word formed like our 'prizefighter:' the Greek is ἐθηριομάχησα: the Greek for *I fought with beasts* would be θηρίοις ἐμαχεσάμην. Compare γεροντανωγεῖν (Sophocl.) = *to be an old-man's guide*—a settled occupation—not *to guide an old man*.

Evidently *beasts* in a figure are here meant, *brutes in human form*. Ignatius ad Rom. 5: 'From Syria all the way to Rome I am a beastfighter by land and sea.' These brutes in Ephesus were, probably, exasperated Jews, ferocious enemies of the cross and of St. Paul: compare Acts xx. 19. The aorist in *I became beastfighter* points either to some incident unrecorded or more probably to a definite period of time during which the conflict raged and then ceased.

It may be added that these brutes could not possibly be wild beasts of the amphitheatre inasmuch as St. Paul's right of Roman citizenship protected him from the arena: by his *jus civitatis* he was shielded from condemnation *ad leonem*.

What *in human fashion* (κατ' ἄνθρωπον) means, is not clear: it is a phrase obscure in the obscurity of its context, which yields an uncertain light. It may signify *on the level of man's view*, i.e. *with no aspirations beyond the horizon of this life*, regardless of the future glory which is conditioned by resurrection.

*Let us eat and drink.*] Isa. xxii. 13. See LXX Version, whence this text is taken *verbatim*.

**33.** *Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.*] Full sense: **Be not led astray** in this maze of Satan (πλάνη): those freethinkers will tell you that, as the body in the grave perishes, so the sins of the body touch not the immortal spirit: this is not true (ch. vi. 19): beware of intercourse with those freethinkers: remember the proverb '**Evil companionships corrupt honest characters.**' This last proverb is a Greek verse from the Thaïs of Menander.

**34.** *Awake to righteousness.*] A fine expression, but scarcely a true translation: there is no notion of *awaking* unless it be in the preposition ἐκ: nor does δικαιῶς = δίκαιοι, as some, who quote Thucyd. i. 21. Rather **shake off your stupor** (*drunken fit*) **in a right spirit**, or *be sober again in right fashion* (see Ajax. 550): others *as in duty bound:* not so good.

*And sin not.*] Change from the aorist to the imperfect imperative; ἐκνήψατε, but ἁμαρτάνετε, not ἁμάρτητε. The imperfect here does not denote *habit* but a *process commencing*. Full sense: 'beware of seduction into error, tamper not with the evil, but take heed lest ye decline step by step from the faith and from virtue into heresy and so into immorality. Glide not insensibly into sin by listening to the perilous fallacies of those *some* (τινὲς of v. 12) for (I tell you) *ignorance of God some have in the grain*. Here *have* = *are affected with:* so Meyer well.

N.B. Ἀγνωσία, not ἀγνοία, seems to mean *unknowingness* or incapacity of knowing God: but are there instances of this use? The phrase πρὸς ἐντροπὴν means (expanded) *with a view to producing shamefacedness:* pregnant or elliptical use of preposition, as in a thousand other passages: compare ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν *with a view to the dead being raised* (precisely same construction, only a *change of mental posture*) and Coloss. ii. 23, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός *with a view to checking licentiousness*. The verb λαλῶ here means not *I speak this*, as in the A.V., but *do I talk*.

Render and explain this last sentence—**for absolute ignorance or unknowingness of God some have in the grain: to make you feel ashamed am I talking;** in order that feeling ashamed ye may be wary of keeping company with those SOME.

**35.** *But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?*] Render, **But still, some one will say, how raised are the dead? or with what kind of body do they come?** An objector is now supposed to moot a question to this effect: *But nevertheless, granting the fact of resurrection, I should like to know in what manner and by what process they are raised—those dead! or with what sort of body, forsooth, will they come, when the Lord comes?* That the Apostle makes the objector speak with the self-assurance and contemptuousness of a 'knowsomething' may be inferred from his own sharp reply, *Fool! what thou sowest . . .*

Connection between vv. 34 and 35. St. Paul having warned his hearers to avoid intercourse with the deniers of resurrection,

Digitized by Google

36 *Thou* fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die:

37 And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other *grain*:

38 But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.

39 All flesh *is* not the same flesh: but *there is* one *kind of* flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, *and* another of birds.

---

who because of this denial were becoming morally careless (so intimately bound up together are right doctrine and right practice), now proceeds to expound *the nature of the future bodies*.

N.B. The word *but* here means *but still*, and belongs not to the statement of St. Paul *some one will say*, but to the question of the objector *nevertheless how, I ask. And with* . . . rather *or*, i.e. 'or to put the question in another shape;' the disjunctive particle presents a different side of the same idea.

36. *Thou fool* . . .] Analogies drawn from common experiences of nature, preparatory to the dogmatic teachings of v. 42 ff. Render, **Fool! what thou sowest:** emphasis on *thou:* argument *a minori ad majus:* if what thou, a silly mortal, sowest is after decomposition quickened, how much more shall what God soweth by the hand of the sexton, even the human body, be made alive after dissolution. Meyer makes *thou* antithetical to *God* in v. 38: but the interval is too great.

Chrysostom *in loco* to this effect: 'These heretics say, The body is not raised because it dies: I reply, The body because it dies is therefore raised. Again they say, If there be a raising, one body falls, another is raised. I reply, Resurrection is a raising of that which is fallen: whatever body falls, the same is raised and yet raised not the same, in many respects different, in all superior.

*is not quickened, except it die.*] The seed *sown* and *dying* is the analogue of the body *buried* and *decaying*. Every living seed contains within itself a germ or minute embryo plant. Under ground this germ begins to grow at the expense of the seed: soon the main bulk of the seed is gone, and nothing remains of it but the rotten shrivelled husk. Thus it 'dies:' this *dying of the seed* corresponds to the *decaying of the body* which is already dead and buried. Decomposition is a condition necessary to reproduction: every higher form of life presupposes the loss of that which precedes it. This is a law of nature. The growth of tuberous and bulbous roots is analogous to that of seeds. In digging up potatoes the decaying corpse of the old one which was planted is found among the new ones.

37. *And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain.*] Render and explain: **And in what thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall appear** (the stately plant of bladed stem, *clothed* with verdure and with ears of corn), **but a naked grain, perchance of wheat.** Emphasis on the word *naked:* the resurrection body shall be *clothed* with glory.

38. *But God giveth it a body, as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.*] Render and explain: *But* or **while God** (it is who) **giveth it a body, in what manner he willed** (i.e. in His counsel of creation before the worlds), **and to every seed a proper body** or **a body of its own.** *He willed:* all things created are God's thoughts of eternity made actual in time.

*God giveth it a body.*] Full sense: God's omnipotence is the *efficient cause*, as corruption is the necessary *condition*, of a seed's reproduction in a new and nobler form of life. In the latent processes from decomposition to reconstitution identity of kind and (in some degree) of substance is preserved, not identity of state: the vital germ of the grain reappears the same in its nature, but in form and in constitution how much handsomer! in quality of substance too how much better! Ridiculous is the question of the caviller, 'With a body of what sort do they come—those dead?' For if God gives to every sown grain a plant-body corresponding in kind to its new state, shall He not in like manner give to every buried man a proper resurrection body? Or does this caviller imagine that the dead body shall come forth just the same? as did the body of Lazarus? Every stalk of wheat shakes its luxuriant head at him.

39. *All flesh is not the same flesh.*] Render **Not all flesh is the same flesh.** Another argument for some identity, yet more diversity between bodies buried and risen. *Flesh* is a substance common to all animals and yet how different in each species, in mankind and in cattle, fishes, birds. *Beasts* here should be rendered **cattle.** The underlying sense of this verse seems to be: there is identity and yet diversity of human flesh in the old creation and in the new: the same flesh, that

Digitized by Google

40 *There are* also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial *is* one, and the *glory* of the terrestrial *is* another.

41 *There is* one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for *one* star differeth from *another* star in glory.

42 So also *is* the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption:

43 It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power:

44 It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.

---

was taken of the first Adam by the last, was by Him who took it made diverse in that it was hallowed and glorified. In the resurrection the flesh of the saints shall be consubstantiated with the glorified flesh of the risen Christ. De Wette and others make *flesh* here to mean *animal organisms:* rather *the substance* is meant: the idea of *organism* appears in the next verse. The sequence of the things co-ordinated is *flesh*, *body*, *lustre*.

**40.** Render, **Bodies too celestial** there are **and bodies terrestrial.** Emphasis both times on the word *bodies:* the argument proceeds from diversities of *flesh* in God's creation to diversities of *bodily organisms.* Bodies celestial here can hardly denote bodies of angels, as de Wette and Meyer, for it does not appear that angels possess constituted bodies: they can improvise corporeities and appear in human form, as two of them did to Abraham at Mamre. Neither can the phrase denote *the planets*, as Delitzsch, because the idea of the *heavenly bodies* presents no proper parallel to that of *flesh* in the preceding verse. *Living bodily organisms* are here meant. St. Paul may possibly have been thinking, not of the planets themselves, but of bodies dwelling *upon* the planets (ἐπουράνια) as diverse from bodies dwelling *upon* the earth (ἐπίγεια). For if the planets are inhabited, the Apostle might easily have learnt this truth, not indeed scientifically but in one of his superabundant revelations. If so, bodies *planetarian* will be contrasted with bodies *terrestrial*, as organisms differing the one class from the other. This theory would not be invalidated by the next sentence, for there the contrast is apparently not between a natural glory and a supernatural, but between two natural glories. This is made probable by the contrasted glories of sun, moon, stars in the next verse.

**41.** Not only stars differ from sun and moon, but **star from star differs** in glory: the diversities of brilliancy are infinite.

**42.** Connection with the foregoing: there is a sameness in some respects and a difference in others between the seed and the plant, between the flesh of man and the flesh of animals, between living bodies in the heavens and living bodies on the earth, between the dazzling sheen of the sun and the rayless sheen of the moon and the sparkling sheen of the stars, yea between the diverse brilliancies of stars compared with stars. Unquestionably: but just as between these manifold creations in their several co-ordinations there is identity of nature and of substance and community of certain properties, but at the same time diversity in form and in rank, quality, beauty, glory; in like manner is the resurrection also of the dead (saints). There is between buried and risen bodies of saints identity in kind and some in substance, yet much diversity in form and in state: for what was sown or buried, the same is raised, but raised not the same: that which was disfigured by death and corruption is now transfigured into life and incorruptibility: for 'sown it is in a state of corruption, raised in a state of incorruptibility' (ἀφθαρσίᾳ, compare ἀγνωσίαν, v. 34).

**43.** *It is sown in dishonour . . .*] Hardly, as Meyer, 'the sowing is man's act, the raising is God's': rather man buries, and God sows by the hand of man who buries: He who sows, raises also. *In dishonour* is to be understood of the *fœditas cadaveris.* *In glory*, a state proper to the resurrection bodies, Phil. iii. 21. *In weakness*, in a condition of utter powerlessness. *In power;* what a change! a body radiant with the glory and endowed with fulness of capacity (δυνάμει) for life and activity in a new sphere.

**44.** *It is sown a natural body.*] *Natural* here means *animal* in the sense of *psychical*, i.e. a body fitted for the *anima* or *psyché*, a tenement meet for the life of the soul: a material instrument of flesh and blood and sense-organs, by which the soul holds converse with the outer world of sensible objects, seeing, hearing, touching, acting. This communication is good or evil precisely according as the soul is willing to be guided by man's spirit, itself guided by God's Spirit.

*A spiritual body* is a bodily organism adapted to the life of the spirit, and controlled thereby. In it the soul has taken its proper position of subordination: man's spirit now

Digitized by Google

45 And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam *was made* a quickening spirit.

46 Howbeit that *was* not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual.

---

holds the administrative power and, ruled by God's Spirit, rules the body through the executive medium of the willing soul. Man is at last, what God originally intended him to be, a creature in whom the spirit is the personifying principle and the seat of government: his proper self down from his own spirit, as from a throne, reigns supreme over the soul and through that over the body, in a threefold harmony: the harmony of the parts is the unity of the whole: for the body is now reconstituted meet for the new government: it is *pneumatic*, no longer *psychical*.

N.B. In the hour of Adam's probation, as his spirit was to him the vehicle of fellowship with the Holy Spirit and his body the channel of communication with the sensible world, so his soul or self-living nature had to decide between two attractions, a higher and a lower, whether it would consent in accordance with the divine intention to be determined by the spirit and thereby continue in fellowship with God, or would conclude against God and choose a life of selfish independence. By the fall of Adam his fellowship with God was dissolved, and the divine *life* of the spirit was quenched, although its divine *substance* remained, but not unimpaired.

*There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.*] Render, **If there is an animal body, there is a spiritual also.** Emphasis on *is* both times: *is* means *exists.* Full sense: if God could create *a body fitted for the soul*, He can as easily create *a body fitted for the spirit*, and He *has:* there is already such a body created by Him, and that body possessed by Christ, as being united to the Word.

**45.** *And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.*] Render, **So it is also written, The first man Adam became to be a living soul, the last Adam to be a spirit making alive.**

*Became unto* or *to be*, εἰς. Not *was made*, for the Greek verb means *to become*, denoting a transition from one state to another or from one mode of existence to another. Here the state of *being a living soul* is declared to result from a prior *process of becoming:* what this prior process was, must be gathered from the scripture, Gen. ii. 7, here cited in part by St. Paul. From it we learn that God first fashioned the body of Adam from earth moistened with dew and then breathed or rather blew (ἐνεφύσησεν, the same word as in Joh. xx. 22, a significant repetition of a similar act) into his nostrils the breath of life. This breath of life was spirit and of the divine essence, for *God* who breathed it from Himself *is Spirit.* This communicated *pneuma* of the unlimited *Pneuma* made man in his highest nature of spirit akin to God; but akin only, for by this breath of God man was as far from being God, as a breath of man is from being man. 'If a man,' says Tertullian adv. Marc. ii. 8, 'blow into a flute, he will not make the flute a man, though he blow from his soul as God from His Spirit.' In this process of creation the soul was the product or outflash (ἀπαύγασμα) of the spirit and the connecting link between it and the body. It is called a living soul because it was *designed* to be for a time the self-acting and determining element of man's life, but not for ever—only during his probation. Thus man was created *into* the position of a living soul, but created also *for* a position still higher, should he prove obedient. For if he had obeyed, he would have been advanced into a position in which the spirit and not the soul would have been the ruling principle of life. But Adam failed in his obedience: wherefore the Son of God assumed a body, like Adam's before the fall, consisting of flesh and blood, whereby He ate, drank, slept and suffered and died. He became man, in order that He might *become* (by means of a sinless obedience unto death or, some say, by means of the resurrection simply) *to be* (after His resurrection and more fully after His ascension) not only a spirit *made alive* for evermore, but a spirit *making alive* for evermore, Himself both rising from the dead and raising others, man immortal making men immortal, an inexhaustible Fountain of the resurrection life to all believers. *The last Adam:* St. Paul by this declares the destination, for which man was originally designed, to be an object defeated in Adam, but attained in Christ: the last Adam concludes the history of humanity.

N.B.—Some understand ζωοποιοῦν, *life-giving* and *life-bestowing:* that cannot be correct; for example, ζωγρεῖν means not *to take life* but, the contrary, *to take alive.* So ζωοποιεῖν (from ζωός *alive*, not from ζωή *life*) means not 'to vitalise' but to 'vivify' or 'make alive from a state of death.'

**46.** *Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and*

Digitized by Google

47 The first man *is* of the earth, earthy: the second man *is* the Lord from heaven.

48 As *is* the earthy, such *are* they also that are earthy: and as *is* the heavenly, such *are* they also that are heavenly.

49 And as we have borne the

---

*afterward that which is spiritual.*] Rather **Howbeit or But still not first is the spiritual, but the psychical or animal; next to that the spiritual.** St. Paul states generally the divine law of development which runs through all creation, a gradation from lower to higher forms of life.

**47.** *The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.*] Render. **The first man is out of earth, of mould, the second man out of heaven.**

The first beginnings of the two heads of mankind are here in their essences sharply contrasted. Adam before he had become actually to be a living soul-nature was already fashioned out of earth. It is true that he had a heavenly side also to his origin, even the divine spirit breathed into his nostrils, just as Christ too had an earthly side to His, when He took flesh of the Virgin Mary. But the antithesis here is drawn sharp between the essential foundations of the two humanities: the protoplast was *earthborn* (γηγενὴς πρωτόπλαστος, Wisd. of Sol. vii. 1); the second man out of heaven, *Son of God* (Luke i. 35). The one, in that God the Creator first formed dust of the ground into a human body, had a real earthly, even earthy, beginning: the other had a real heavenly, even divine, beginning, inasmuch as from God the Redeemer came 'Holy Spirit and a power of the Highest,' overshadowing the Virgin Mary (Luke i. 35).

The word *heaven* in this text, like the word *earth*, is used in a sense rather essential than local. The absence of the article indicates this, not necessitates it. Of the many heavens the one which is here meant is the *uncreated Heaven* of God's own eternal residence and self-manifestation in the divine glory. This illocal Heaven is to be distinguished from the inferior heaven of the glory manifested to blessed creatures. This latter is local, called sometimes *cælum empyreum*, the eternal home of angels and of saints, the collective whole of the 'many mansions.' That the uncreated Heaven is itself 'the excellent glory,' appears from 2 Pet. i. 17, comp. with ver. 18: and that into it our ascending Lord entered, having passed *through* the created heavens and 'far *above*' them all, appears from Ephes. iv. 10 and Hebr. iv. 14: see Delitzsch on the last text, from whom these remarks on the diverse heavens are in part borrowed.

If the above view be correct, in this verse the material or earthy and *human* (from *humus*, it is said) side of the first man's origin is sharply contrasted with the spiritual or *divine* side of the origin of the Godman. Others render *of the earth* and *from heaven* in local sense, connecting the latter phrase with the manifestation of the Lord at the Parousia. Rather against this view is the appended phrase *made of dust or mould*, which will then lack a proper correlative in the second clause. If ἐκ γῆς here means *out of earth* or *terrenus*, not *terrestis*, χοικός will be an emphatic enhancement of the same idea, meaning *pulvereus*, i. e. not only 'of earth' but 'of earth's mould:' compare Gen. iii. 19, 'earth thou art and into earth shalt thou return:' γῆ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν. This material dust was watered with the dews of Eden: compare Milton's accurate phrase *mortal mixture of earth's mould* and Horace's *princeps limus*.

It may be added that memorials of man's double-sided origin and destiny are perpetuated in the sacraments. The terrene or earthborn elements of water and of bread and wine are symbols or counterparts of the Spirit and of the heavenly body and divine blood.

The distinction between *Heaven* and the *heavenlies* in these verses should be noted. Cælum ipsum *est cælum in quo Deus est etiam quando cælum creatum nullum est, ipsa gloria divina:* Sebastian Schmidt.

**48.** *As is the earthy, such are, &c.*] From the *cælum ipsum* (Heb. ix. 24), or God's Heaven, 'out of which the Son of man came down' (John iii. 13), the mind of the Apostle makes a transit to the lower local heavens, or 'the Father's house of many mansions,' and to them that are in those heavens, first to the Godman Himself, and then to all who are *such as He*, all who after the resurrection are like Him.

There is a contrast here between the two creations, as in the preceding verse between the two heads. Akin to the head of the old humanity are the members of it, all of them from dust and unto dust, out of earth in the beginning moulded, and upon earth for a while sojourning, and into earth at last returning. Akin also to the Head of the new humanity are the members thereof; born from above, they are a new creation in Christ destined to be like Him, of the celestial commonwealth (ἐπουράνιοι), that is, to dwell with Him in the new heavens and



Digitized by Google

image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

50 Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

51 Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,

52 In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

53 For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal *must* put on immortality.

54 So when this corruptible shall

---

the new earth, *when God shall plant heavens and lay the foundations of an earth and shall say to Zion, Thou art my people* (Isaiah li. 16).

N.B.—The local sense of the word *heavenly* in this verse, as indeed in v. 40 above, may be certainly inferred from Hebr. 9, 23, where τὰ ἐπουράνια and τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς are identified.

**49.** *And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear.*] *We have borne:* render, **we bore**: the view is a retrospect, looking backward from the point of the resurrection in the Parousia. Emphatic here are the utterances of the words *bore* and *bear:* they both point to external appearance: the second denotes the manifestation of the sons of God in spiritual bodies at the resurrection. If the word *image* is borrowed from coinage, the sense of the whole will be: The substance or material of the old humanity is even in this life in process of being secretly transmuted and refined by a 'celestial fire' and recast in a heavenly mould: in the resurrection the new metal will be restamped with the new image. Now, indeed, we carry in the animal body the unmistakable copy of our earthborn original, but hereafter we shall bear in the spiritual body the indelible impress and character of our divine archetype. More probably, however, the figure is taken from *clothing*, as in the bladed plant evolved from the naked grain ver. 37; in that case, the idea will be, We shall *wear* the image of the Godman, when we have *put on* immortality.

*we shall bear.*] Render, **we must bear**, or **we are to bear**: the best supported reading φορέσωμεν need not be rendered *let us bear*, as Chrysostom, when all along nothing is hortatory, but all dogmatic and declaratory. St. Paul in these verses is dealing, not with *ethics*, but with *physiology*. If we read φορέσωμεν and render *we are to bear*, the sense is much the same as the sense of *we shall bear*, only the structure of the clause changes from a stated apodosis *we shall bear* to a protasis with an apodosis not stated.

**50.** *flesh and blood*] i.e. the psychical or animal organism of the present body.

*cannot inherit.*] i.e. from its very constitution, *is not in a position* to do so. Read δύναται, not δύνανται: for clearly *flesh and blood* represents one twofold idea, and therefore requires a verb singular.

*doth inherit.*] i.e. ever inherit: the timeless present of a constant truth.

**51.** *Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep . . .*] Rather, **Behold** (a word arresting attention), **a mystery** (divine secret revealed to me) **do I tell you: not all of us shall fall asleep, all of us however shall be changed.** The rendering of the A.V. is correct; only for *but* may be substituted *yet* or *nevertheless* or *however*.

*Not all* denotes such as shall be alive in the body at the time of the rapture prior to the advent: see 1 Thess. iv. 15, 16. *All of us shall be changed:* all saints, whether alive or deceased, quick or dead, shall be transfigured. That the transfiguration will be *instantaneous* is shown from the context: that it will be *complete* is shown by the aorists.

N.B. Objections of some commentators to the A.V. rendering of this text cannot be sustained. Meyer, for instance, states correctly the well-known distinction between οὐ πᾶς and πᾶς οὐ, but he misapplies the rule: he fails to perceive that this law, true in all other texts, is in this exceptional passage absolutely *overridden by a higher law*. In fact πάντες οὐ here must be rendered precisely as if it were οὐ πάντες: the structure of the sentence demands it: the presence or absence of μέν makes no difference. This might be shewn in full, did space permit.

**52.** *for the trumpet shall sound.*] In the Greek, 'he, the trumpeter, shall trumpet.'

*and we shall be changed.*] i.e. into a state of incorruption: the full sense is: We, who shall not have put off the body, shall be changed not by putting it off but by putting on over it the immortal that shall absorb the mortal: see 2 Cor. v. 4 and notes.

**54.** *Death is swallowed up in victory.*] Rather, **was swallowed up unto victory.**

Digitized by Google

have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.

[a] Hos. 13. 14.
[1] Or, *hell.*

55 [a]O death, where *is* thy sting? O [1]grave, where *is* thy victory?

56 The sting of death *is* sin; and the strength of sin *is* the law.

57 But thanks *be* to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

58 Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.

---

The apostle transplants himself, as once or twice before in this chapter, to an eminence beyond the Parousia, and views therefrom the sudden absorption or abolition of death in fulfilment of a prophecy, which he adapts from Isaiah xxv. 8: see notes there. **Unto** *victory*, as the result of Death's disappearance in the lake of fire. The final engulfment of the all-engulfing monster issues in victory.

55. *O grave.*] Render, *O Death.*

58. *Therefore, my beloved.*] After dogmatic declaration comes affectionate exhortation.

*Be ye stedfast, unmoveable.*] Render, **prove ye stedfast, unshifted**, that is **unremoved** from your moorings and fixedness of faith in the Article of the Resurrection: ἀμετακίνητοι, not ἀκίνητοι.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 3, 29.

3. *Christ died for our sins.*] Of all the prepositions in the New Testament none has been so controverted and misunderstood as the preposition *for* (ὑπέρ). The importance of a correct view of it must furnish a plea for this note: for it is not too much to say that numerous texts have been misinterpreted simply because of an erroneous notion which seems to prevail amongst modern commentators concerning this preposition. The ancient Greek Fathers found no difficulty in it. The differences of moderns about it are due apparently to the fact that a kind of theological crust has been allowed to form around the pure and intrinsic meaning of the word. This time-hallowed accretion seems now to be stereotyped in the two senses *in behalf of* and *instead of.* Whereas the truth is that *neither* of these is the *essential* sense of the preposition. To ascertain this radical meaning is most desirable, if we wish to understand more thoroughly other texts besides the one before us, such for example as 'He was delivered *for* our offences and was raised again *for* (διά) our justification.' What is this radical meaning? In the two well known texts, *He died for our sins*, i. e. 'with a view to their abolition' and *He died for us*, i. e. 'with a view to our redemption,' what is that essential sense of *for* (ὑπέρ) which is common to both the uses? It is this: the *for* properly means *over*, Latin *super.* In the New Testament it happens never to signify *over* in the sense of local or physical position, as when a man leans over a table or bends over a grave, but is always used in a moral or rational sense, as when a man talks another man over or thinks a matter over. In short, this preposition denotes *mental posture*, the *attitude of a spirit or mind bending over an ideal object either in tender solicitude or simply by way of contemplation and nothing more.* Whether this attitude has relation to *persons* or to *things*, the context determines: the preposition itself is quite indifferent.

This view will become clearer, if we explain the two cognate texts *He died for us* and *He died for our sins* by means of a familiar illustration. When a surgeon, for instance, is called in to attend a wounded soldier, he bends over the patient whom he examines in general, then over the wound which he examines in particular, before he proceeds to apply remedies. Not otherwise the divine Physician Himself, moving through the vast hospital of fallen creations, when He comes to the stricken Adam, stoops over him in deepest commiseration, stoops over the moral wound of universal sin, and proceeds to apply the remedy. Knowing that there is but one remedy and that an extreme one, no less than the sacrifice of His own life, He notwithstanding applies it, draining into his own suffering humanity the moral virus, apart from guilt, and healing death by death. *Mors mortis morti mortem ni morte dedisset*, mankind indeed were in the saddest case. See Athanasius de incarnatione Verbi, § 26–27.

It should be remarked that whether the moral or spiritual attitude denoted by this word *for* is an attitude to be referred to the



Digitized by Google

Incarnate Son, or to God the Father as the first cause of man's redemption, or to the Tripersonal Deity, is a question lying outside the preposition itself.

It may be added that Meyer takes the correct view of this text in ver. 3, rendering it *on account of our sins with a view to their expiation.* But why did not Meyer take the same view of the same preposition in a clause of the same construction in this chapter, 'What shall they do who are baptized *for* the dead'? Probably because in that text the *for* is connected with *persons*, in this with *things*. He failed to extricate his generally accurate mind from the deep-set groove of modern opinion that this preposition ὑπέρ, associated with a personal genitive, must signify *in behalf of* or *instead of*. This last idea is not true.

Chrysostom says well *in loco*, 'If Christ died on account of alien sin, it follows that He himself was *unsinning*, or more exactly *unsinned* (ἀναμάρτητος).' The doctrine of *vicarious* satisfaction is to be inferred from other texts, not from this. Ἀντί, not ὑπέρ conveys this idea.

**29.** *what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?*] It seems strange that such a variety of views should mark modern commentators on this controverted text. This variety may perhaps be traced in its source to a rooted opinion that the preposition *for* (ὑπέρ) must mean *in behalf of* or *for the benefit of* or *in place of*. This opinion is not true: for the construction in this verse is precisely the same as in verse 3, and there is no more difficulty in this text than in that.

Just as Christ died both *for us* and *for our sins*, i.e. with a mind bent *over us* in order to our redemption or *over our sins* with an eye to their abolition, even so catechumens in baptism emerged from the hallowed streams with their thoughts busy about or intent upon the dead: not upon the dead, as so many *particular persons* (another modern view scarcely correct), but as a general class or category—distinct from the living on earth. This distinction of two categories is shewn by the generic articles οἱ and τῶν, the latter used for the first time before νεκρῶν in this chapter and for the purpose of contrasting class with class, i.e. the plural object in one class *the dead* with the plural subject in one class *the baptized. The dead* here means all the possible dead up to the Parousia contemplated as being raised in Him who is the Firstborn of "the church of the firstborn." The risen Christ may be included in the category, and even the catechumens themselves *prospectively*.

As on this v. 29 moderns differ much from each other and still more from the ancients, this critique may be allowed to proceed a little further. The controversy turns upon the preposition. According to modern commentators it means *in behalf of* and a little more; according to the ancient it denotes *in behalf of* and much more. Frequent in Greek both Attic and Hellenistic are uses of this preposition denoting not only *in behalf of* but also *on account of, with an interest in, concerning, with a view to* or simply *in relation to:* the specific nature of the relation, lying outside the indifferent preposition, is always determined either by the neighbouring context or (failing such context) by the familiar circumstances of the case. For instance in the verse *He died for our sins*, with the outlying circumstance which alone explains this verse all Scripture rings again: without this broad sunshine from without, the text would be to a Pagan a dark problem. Even so in the clause *baptized for the dead*, i.e. *with respect to them* or *with an eye upon them* or (as in the Greek idiom) *with the mind over them*, what is the context of this clause, which without a context is a problem without a solution? The whole chapter roars with the context, not to mention the familiar circumstance of the baptismal rite: both *context* and *circumstance* together proclaim that the ulterior view of a neophyte's mind bending over the long roll or class of the dead is their *resurrection*. But to make certainty doubly certain and misconception simply impossible, in the very next verse St. Paul in accents of thunder reiterates the same keynote: *if absolutely not raised are dead men, why do persons actually receive baptism on their account?*

The A.V. rendering *for the dead*, rightly understood, is good and may well be retained. In defence of it, and in further illustration of the elastic and elliptic use of prepositions, the following remarks may be added. Nothing is more common in our own language whether written or spoken, than the elliptical use of the preposition *for*. In fact, in what way St. Paul in our text writes, in the same way we *daily talk*. One instance of this may be cited. The writer of this note remembers, many years ago some time between the death of the Duke of Wellington and his public funeral how by chance he heard a lady, pointing to some crape lying on a table near her, say "This will be of use *for* the Duke of Wellington." Immediately came to his mind this text 'What shall persons do who are baptized *for* the dead' as parallel in structure to the sentence uttered. For the sentence expanded in full signified, This crape will be of use for me to wear on the day of the funeral of the Duke of Wellington. The *for* here denoted *in relation to*, and the several links of the relation between the crape and

Digitized by Google

the Duke were on the instant mentally supplied from the well-known *circumstances of the case*. The context of the remark was familiar. The remark itself may be fairly rendered in Greek χρήσιμα ταῦτ' ἂν εἴη ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄνακτος: see Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 34.

But a passage from Shakspeare will serve still better to illustrate this use of *for* and to elucidate our text. Macbeth, act iv. sc. 3. 'They all were struck *for thee*.' Who could tell the meaning of this sentence without the context? With a suitable context *for thee* might signify *in thy stead* or *in thy behalf*—with a view to saving thy life: but the actual context shews that the words do mean in full *with a view to thy chastisement—to make thee smart for thy sins, Macduff*. The application of this elliptical use of *for* to our English text is obvious.

Unquestionably the right view of this controverted passage is that of the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret and others. In reading their comments it is quite clear that they found no more difficulty in St. Paul's elliptical use of the Greek ὑπέρ than we do in Shakspeare's elliptical use of the English *for*. They did not hesitate in their homilies to expound that the phrase *for the dead* meant *with an interest in the resurrection of the dead* or that *for* by itself meant even so much as *in expectation of the resurrection*. A sample of this from Theophylact, τί ποιήσουσιν ἀπατηθέντες; τί δὲ ὅλως καὶ βαπτίζονται ἄνθρωποι ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ προσδοκίᾳ ἀναστάσεως, εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται; In other words, they, in preaching to the audiences of their own day, inserted in this text that illuminative context, which to a Corinthian congregation, hearing this 15th chapter read aloud throughout, might be well omitted and was omitted by St. Paul. For in simple speech all unnecessary contexts are *omitted in order to save time*. Hence the phrase the *elliptical* use of a preposition.

But notwithstanding the obvious correctness of the one patristic interpretation the modern counter-view seems to be gaining ground. Against this view, mischievous as well as erroneous, a few words must be said. It seems, as before stated, to have sprung from contracted notions of the elastic ὑπέρ. To such lengths has this prepositional error led recent commentators that actually they seem to see lurking in the folds of this text, which their own perplexities have made a mazy labyrinth (see *in loco* Alford's note of bewilderment and Stanley's prodigious inferences), a veritable Minotaur in the shape of *vicarious baptism*. Nowhere in all the contexts of this verse (and there are three) nor in the text itself is there the shadow of a peg on which to hang this monstrous superstition. If 'monstrous' should appear to any one a strong epithet, let him peruse homily 40 of Chrysostom, who seems to have moved his audience to loud laughter by drawing a ludicrous picture of this profane custom. After assigning its origin to Satan, who delights in caricatures of holy rites, the preacher proceeds to shew that *vicarious baptism* in its legitimate issues must lead to something like *salvation by proxy*. Now if *such* a superstition, even in the germ, had appeared in Corinth before the date of this epistle, would not St. Paul have come down upon it with all his thunder? Would he not have devoted a whole chapter to its extinction? A chapter commencing with a quiet statement in the usual way (see ch. v. 1), *I hear* or *it is reported that some among you receive baptism more than once*—δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον—*and that for dead persons*—ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν without the τῶν and perhaps with a τινῶν to balance the τινές and to contrast living persons with dead persons, just as the whole category of catechumens is contrasted with the whole class of the dead by the οἱ and the τῶν in the text. This calm commencement would have been followed by keen argument and keener invective. For if in ch. vi. the Apostle lashed his converts with cutting sarcasms for presuming to litigate before heathen tribunals, certainly he would have chastised them tenfold for harbouring in their midst the rank heresy of the one holy baptism repeated: let alone its being repeated vicariously *for the benefit* (as Meyer says, misunderstanding the ὑπέρ) *of believers who had died unbaptized!*

The truth of the matter is, that this famous text was *afterwards* singled out by heresiarchs and made the basis of vicarious baptism and its mischievous sequels. The wicked Marcion (see Chrysostom, Hom. 40) boldly *divorced it from its contexts* and by wilful misrepresentation (παραποίησις) made his credulous hearers believe that ὑπέρ in this passage meant *over* in a local sense: and so it does sometimes with suitable context, but not in this passage nor elsewhere in the Greek Testament. But what cared Marcion for that? Marcion had a heresy to found, and he founded it on this text.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XVI.

*1 He exhorteth them to relieve the want of the brethren at Jerusalem. 10 Commendeth Timothy, 13 and after friendly admonitions, 16 shutteth up his epistle with divers salutations.*

NOW concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.

2 Upon the first *day* of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as *God* hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.

3 And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by *your* letters, them will I send to bring your [1]liberality unto Jerusalem.

4 And if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with me.

5 Now I will come unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia: for I do pass through Macedonia.

6 And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go.

7 For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit,

8 But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.

[1] Gr. *gift.*

---

CHAP. XVI. Summary: directions about the collection and transmission of alms for the poor saints in Jerusalem: after which come salutations, autograph, benediction.

1. *as I have given order to the churches.*] Render, **just as I made arrangement for the churches.** The time and occasion are not known. Bengel, referring to 2 Cor. ix. 2 and Rom. xv. 26, aptly remarks, 'St. Paul holds up as an example to the Corinthians the Galatians, to the Macedonians the Corinthians, to the Romans the Macedonians: great is the force of example.' See Rom. xv. 26.

2. *let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.*] Rather, **storing up whatever he may prosper in, that when I come no gatherings may then take place**: for *then* will be the time, not for collecting, but for producing the sum of what has been week by week hoarded at home from profits in trade.

3. *And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters.*] Place comma after *approve* and render **when I arrive, whomsoever ye may approve, these with letters** (credential) **will I send to carry home your bounty unto Jerusalem; if, however, it should be worth while that I too make the journey, with me shall they journey.** Emphasis on *me*. The *givers* of the sum are to *choose the bearers* of it; St. Paul is to be the *sender*, being God's apostle and steward: he is to furnish the bearers with letters commendatory to leading saints in Jerusalem. If however the greatness of the collection or the dignity of the occasion should require it, instead of writing letters of credit, he will travel in person: the bearers of the bounty shall be the Apostle's escort from Corinth to Jerusalem. Quiet assertion of apostolic dignity: *justa æstimatio sui non est superbia:* Bengel.

5, 6. *Now I will come unto you, &c.*] Render these verses, **Now I shall come to see you, when I have passed through Macedonia; for through Macedonia do I pass** (without halting), **but with you** (*you* emphatic), **I shall perhaps make a stay, or shall even winter, that you** (*you* emphatic) **may escort me wherever I may journey.** St. Paul here announces a change in his plan of route: he had intended to pass from Ephesus across the Ægaean to Corinth, from Corinth into Macedonia, and from Macedonia back again to Corinth, so as to pay a double visit to his Corinthian converts: he now prefers a single visit to the double. See 2 Cor. i. 15, 16. *Shall winter:* this intention he executed: he spent three winter months in Achaïa: Acts xx. 3.

7. *For I will not see you now by the way, but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit.*] Connect with the foregoing verse and render: When I have traversed Macedonia, I shall perhaps make a stay or even spend the winter with *you:* **for I do not intend to see you just in passing: for I hope to stay on some time with you, if the Lord permit.**

*To see you* here means 'to catch a sight of you:' aorist tense: emphasis on *you:* this is the third emphasis of delicate or affectionate preference on the word *you* in vv. 6 and 7.

*just in passing.*] The word *just* (ἄρτι) is timeless in itself: it serves to make precise

Digitized by Google

9 For a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and *there are* many adversaries.

10 Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear: for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also *do*.

11 Let no man therefore despise him: but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me; for I look for him with the brethren.

12 As touching *our* brother Apollos, I greatly desired him to come unto you with the brethren; but his will was not at all to come at this time; but he will come when he shall have convenient time.

13 Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.

14 Let all your things be done with charity.

15 I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and *that* they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,)

16 That ye submit yourselves unto such, and to every one that helpeth with *us*, and laboureth.

17 I am glad of the coming of

---

any time, past, present, future, with which it happens to be in company: compare Aristoph. ἄρτι νυνί, *just now*. This is better than the ordinary interpretation 'For I am not willing *this time* to see you in passing.'

**8, 9.** *But I will tarry at Ephesus, &c.*] Render, **I shall stay on** (ἐπιμενῶ) **in Ephesus until Pentecost, for a door stands open to me great and busy** or **full of employment.**

*door*] i.e. opportunity. *Many adversaries*, including the brutes in human shape, xv. 32: see Acts xix.

**10.** *Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear.*] Omit the *may* and render, **Now if Timotheus should come, see that without fear he appear before you.** *Appear before you* in assembly: for the phrase see ch. ii. 3 and notes: the view taken there of this phrase is here confirmed. *Without fear:* we should not from this infer, as some do, that Timothy was timid and bashful, but rather that the Corinthians were tumid and boastful: in fact, they were so 'puffed up' (φυσιοῦσθαι, *to be inflated* occurs six or seven times in this Epistle) that to encounter their arrogance required no common courage: even St. Paul, fresh from Athens, 'appeared before them in fear and in much trembling,' ii. 3.

**11.** *with the brethren.*] i.e. Erastus and some others: see Acts xix. 22.

**12.** *As touching our brother Apollos, I greatly desired him to come unto you with the brethren, but his will was not at all to come at this time.*] Render, **concerning the brother Apollos, often did I advise him that he come to visit you in company with the brethren, and positively there was no will that he should come now, but come he will whenever he shall find time** or **a convenient time.**

*with the brethren.*] Who were these? The Corinthian Christians who journeyed from Ephesus to Corinth with this Epistle? Or fellow travellers with Timothy and Erastus? Not known: historical data are lacking.

*there was not a will that he should come.*] In *whom* there was no will, is not specified: Theophylact and others explain 'it was not God's will:' this is more correct than to refer the will to Apollos, for if St. Paul had meant this, he would probably have written οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἐλθεῖν.

N.B. The word *greatly* of the A. V. should be rendered *often* (πολλά): this the aorist tense *demands*, let alone other reasons.

**13, 14.** *Watch ye.*] Rather, **Be ye wakeful.** Of these two verses the several clauses are levelled against existing evils in the church of Corinth: against the drowsy infection of bad example (xv. 33), against the clamour of no-resurrection, against effeminacy and profligacy, against factiousness and party-spirit. The imagery is military; **be ye wakeful,** lest Satan's crafty assaults in the guise of evil companionship surprise you napping at your post: **stand fast in the faith** maintaining firm foothold in the outwork of the Resurrection: **quit ye like men, be hardy** repulsing all sallies of sensuality: **let all your doings proceed in charity** and move on the lines of love—a sure safeguard against internal divisions and ambitious rivalries.

**15.** *the firstfruits.*] i.e. unto Christ: see Rom. xvi. 5: the household of Stephanas was the first family of converts in Achaïa.

**16.** *That ye submit yourselves unto such.*] Render **that ye also:** that ye likewise, in recognition of their primacy in the faith, submit or defer to men of this high stamp and holy mark.

**17.** *for that which was lacking on your part they have supplied.*] Rather perhaps,

Digitized by Google

Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus: for that which was lacking on your part they have supplied.

18 For they have refreshed my spirit and your's: therefore acknowledge ye them that are such.

19 The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house.

20 All the brethren greet you. Greet ye one another with an holy kiss.

21 The salutation of *me* Paul with mine own hand.

22 If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha.

23 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you.

24 My love *be* with you all in Christ Jesus. Amen.

---

**your vacancy** or **deficiency they by their presence filled up:**] i.e. their arrival filled up the void created by your absence. Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus were delegates from Corinth, bearing to St. Paul the letter of the Corinthian church.

**18.** *For they have refreshed.*] Omit *have*: the time of their arrival was the time of refreshing.

**19.** *The churches of Asia.*] The churches on the western coastlands of Asia Minor, where Ephesus also lay.

*Salute you much.*] Rather, **greet you many greetings:** on Aquila and Priscilla, see Acts xviii. 2: they had removed from Corinth to Ephesus.

**20.** *All the brethren*] i.e. of the Ephesian church.

*with an holy kiss.*] See Rom. xvi. 16 and notes.

**21, 22.** Endorsement of the Epistle's contents by the Apostle's autograph. St. Paul now takes the place of his amanuensis and himself sums up, like a judge, with a terrible brevity. Apostolic judgment takes the form of a solemn statement: no imprecation in it: 'if any one does *not* love the Lord, let him be devoted to destruction;' not '*may* he be anathema,' but '*let* him be:' there is no help for him; *maranatha*, 'the Lord cometh.' Compare Rev. xxii. 10, 11: "the time is at hand: he that is unjust, *let* him be unjust still, and he which is filthy, *let* him be filthy still."

This sentence is a stern epitome of the whole epistle: 'if any one by profligacy, by contentiousness, by covetousness, by idolatry, by arrogance, by heresy, evinces an utter lack of love to the Lord Jesus, he must abide the consequences of his moral status: there is no outlook in the future for such a man, but the perdition from the presence of the Lord at His coming.' *Maranatha*, an Aramaic expression, denoting 'our Lord is come.'

*If any man love not* should be rendered **if any one does not love,** with emphasis on the *not*: for the negative does not coalesce with the verb, as some maintain, but sharply marks off from the class of faithful Christians all who are *not* faithful.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on ἀγάπη in Chap. XIII.

*Love*, which comprises *charity*, is personal affection grounded on moral esteem, and in the nature of things reaches to comparatively few objects and those personally known to him who loves. *Charity* is goodwill, expressed in good deeds when possible, to others, whether friends or strangers. Thus love and charity are the same in kind, differing in degree: the one is intensive, the other extensive and diffusive. Charity is even universal in its reach. A Christian should be in charity with all men, i.e. should wish well to all: *love* to all, in the sense of personal affection, he is not as yet in a position to entertain. *Amor*, πάθος; *caritas*, ἦθος: Quinctilian. The *principle* may be intensified into *passion*. It is this principle or ethical attitude of humanity, of brotherhood, of readiness to help, of gentleness, forbearance, courtesy, which St. Paul describes in ch. xiii. and viii. 1: and in texts like these, where ἀγάπη occurs alone, without a defining context, it is better rendered by *charity*, as giving the true idea. But in texts where ἀγάπη has a defining context, such as *the love of God* or *love of* (Christian) *brethren*, let it be rendered by *love*, because here the context gives a special determination to the nature of the love (otherwise vague) and condenses it within hallowed limits. It is linguistically correct that the same Greek word be rendered sometimes *charity*, sometimes *love*. This variation is common: comp. κοινωνία, *fellowship* or *contribution* according to circumstances. Moreover *caritas* of the Latin versions is a word *consecrated* by long use in the Church: see Collect for Quinguagesima. The objection that *charity* has of late years become narrowed into *almsgiving*, can hardly be sustained: poor people in general seem to know better, and where they do not, they can be taught.

Digitized by Google

# SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.

### I.—The circumstances under which the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written.

THE exact circumstances under which the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written are but imperfectly known from direct historical evidence, and have to be traced by inferences from which some uncertainty is inseparable. The chief points which furnish a clue to the position of the author and his readers are the following:—

#### i. St. Paul's Second Visit to Corinth.

The fact of this visit, which was made after that on which he founded the Church, but before writing the two Canonical Epistles, is proved by 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1, 2, as is now generally admitted, and these passages also shew that it was a visit of grief and humiliation to himself. We are not without indications of the reason why it was so. There were several evils in the Corinthian Church which caused him grave uneasiness. One was the sectarian divisions treated in 1 Cor. i. 10—iv. 21; but this passage contains no trace of such grief as was occasioned by this visit. On the contrary, in the midst of his counsels on party spirit, he says:—"I write not these things to shame you, but, as my beloved sons, I warn you" (1 Cor. iv. 14). Another was the wicked machinations of the Judaizers treated in 2 Cor. x. 1—xii. 18; but this passage shows that he regarded them, not with grief, but indignation. To suppose that personal defamation or impeachment of his Apostolic office by these men, or any ringleader amongst them, could grieve and humiliate him when present, and when absent cause him affliction, anguish, and tears, seems a radical misunderstanding of his great character. The most glaring evil in Corinth was heathen immorality within the Church; and there is always a reference to this when he speaks of grief in the Second Epistle. In 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, 5, he passes at once from the letter, which he wrote with such extreme distress, to the case of the flagrant offender against purity; and in 2 Cor. vii., especially in ver. 13, there is the same connection. Indeed, in 2 Cor. xiii. 21, 22, where the second visit is alluded to, he says that he dreads a repetition of *humiliation* on his forthcoming third visit, and that he may have to *mourn* over those who had *previously* sinned by extravagant licentiousness; thus showing that the besetting vice of Corinth had occasioned the pain of the second visit, and suggesting a presumption that it had occasioned the visit itself. His grief had not come upon him unexpectedly when he was at Corinth about other matters, for he had *gone* thither *in grief* (2 Cor. ii. 1). He had received intelligence of the immorality, and, either on a summons or of his own accord, he went to check it. There are one or two hints which supply a fair general idea of what occurred. He gave the offenders an opportunity of repentance (xii. 22); he spared (xiii. 1), but announced that he would not do so when he came again. Instead of sharp discipline, he contented himself with a menace. There were good grounds for the milder course. He found the plague widely spread, and the fact that certain persons maintained an antinomian theory with regard to sensuality was in itself sufficient to grieve the founder of this highly-gifted Church, and even to damp his energies. But the embarrassment was complicated, for his Jewish and Judaizing adversaries were standing by, and, no doubt, sneering at what they deemed the

Digitized by Google

natural fruits of his universal and spiritual Gospel, which, in a certain sense, professedly set aside the restrictions of the Law. They watched contemptuously for his measures of correction, but at the same time desired nothing more ardently than that he should resort to them, because this was the surest method of hopelessly embroiling himself with the heathen believers. See 2 Cor. ii. 11 and note. He would have played into their hands, had he used severities; and when, in this dilemma, he confined himself to a threat, the baffled Judaizers would deride, the libertines would think that they had carried the day, and both would ascribe his conduct to pusillanimity and fear. To this he must submit, because he could not wisely pursue any other course; but it was *humiliation*. All this is strongly corroborated by 2 Cor. x. 10. His opponents said that "his bodily presence was weak, and his word quite set-at-nought." This contumelious criticism must have arisen out of his second visit, for that anything which took place on his first should have elicited it is out of the question. Its purport is that he had not shewn the strength requisite to deal vigorously with the moral disorders, and that his threat remained a dead letter. One is tempted to think that he may, at the very crisis of this visit, have been prostrated by suffering from that "stake for the flesh" which he commends the Galatians for not "setting at nought" when they witnessed its effects upon him (Gal. iv. 13, 14). This idea might seem countenanced by xiii. 4, where see note, and by the expression, "lest *God* should *humble* me" (2 Cor. xii. 21), when taken in connection with, "there was *given* me a stake for the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7). It would account pointedly for the humiliation, would harmonize with the phrase "*bodily* presence," and make it comprehensible that he might actually lack the force necessary for dealing adequately with the circumstances before him. But see note on the stake for the flesh at end of chap. xii. However this may be, the visit failed to attain its object, for there is abundant proof in both Epistles that heathen dissoluteness increased, instead of diminishing.

Another particular which confirms the above view of this second visit is what we hear of a letter, no longer extant, but written previously to the First Epistle. The opinion that 1 Cor. v. 9, where this letter is mentioned, refers to the First Canonical Epistle, although countenanced by the Greek Fathers, does not bear the test of strict examination. All that we know of the contents of this letter is, that it counselled renunciation of social intercourse with those who, professing to be believers, led unchaste lives. The identity of this topic with the cause of the visit points to a connection between the visit and the letter, and irresistibly suggests the impression that the Apostle tried, in a letter supplementary to the visit, to give his warnings that efficacy which the so-called weakness of his bodily presence had impaired when he delivered them in person. This connection is again strongly corroborated by 2 Cor. x. 10; for in that passage, as the words "his bodily presence is weak" refer to his bearing on his second visit, so the words "his letters are weighty and powerful" undoubtedly refer in part to this lost letter. The plural number alone implies that his Corinthian enemies were acquainted with more of his *letters* than the First Canonical Epistle.

It has been fairly asked why, as there is an allusion to the missing letter in the First Epistle, there is none to the second visit. The answer is, that there *is* an allusion to it; for it is said in 1 Cor. iv. 8, "But, as though I were not coming to you, some got puffed up." This refers to some past occasion, not further defined, on which the persons meant grew elated, the rendering of the A.V., "*are* puffed up," being incorrect. This elation is exactly what his enemies and the worst of the moral offenders would feel at or after the exhibition of the weakness of his bodily presence. Nor is there anything else to account for it, or for the confidence that he would not appear in Corinth again, except the discomfiture which he seemed to have suffered on that occasion. To this must be added that the lost letter having intervened between the second visit and the First

Digitized by Google

Epistle, it was in that letter, and not in the First Epistle, that allusions to the second visit would naturally occur. It has, indeed, been supposed that there are other allusions to the visit in the First Epistle, but they are doubtful.

Amongst other things which the above considerations help to make clear is the fact that one of the sorest points in the disturbed relation between the Apostle and his Corinthian converts was the growth of unchaste practices in the Church.

As to the date at which the second visit was made and this lost letter written, all the indications, carefully investigated, point decidedly to the period of St. Paul's three years' residence in Ephesus: a view which does not involve any difficulty, when the length of his stay there, and the facilities of communication between Ephesus and Corinth are taken into account.

ii. Plans for a Third Visit.

When present at Corinth for the second time, the Apostle said that he would come again (2 Cor. xiii. 2); and it was indeed a necessity for him to return, unless he meant to abandon his own cause and that of the Gospel. But his purpose was also declared by letter; for in 2 Cor. i. 13, where he repels the charge of deliberate equivocation with regard to this promised visit, he says: "we *write* none other things except what ye *read*." It was then in the missing letter that he gave the first written notice of this third visit. It could not have been in the First Canonical Epistle, for the plan of his journey there stated is not the one first entertained. The first plan is *reproduced* in 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, in order to show what he had originally intended, and that he had been as honest in his first scheme as he had been in the alteration of it. The difference between the two projects is simple. According to the first, he had designed to cross the Ægean from Asia Minor, to make a very brief stay at Corinth on his way to Macedonia, to return again from Macedonia to Corinth, so that the Church might have the benefit of a second visit on one and the same journey in Greece (i. 15), and finally he desired to have a Corinthian escort to Jerusalem, preferring it to an escort from any other Church. Note the personal pronoun in ἀφ' ὑμῶν and its position in i. 16, and compare 1 Cor. xvi. 6. According to the second project the first of the two visits was omitted. He now intended to go to Macedonia first, and then pass on to Corinth, where he would, to use his own expressions, "perhaps," and "if the Lord should permit," remain some time, or even winter with them, as a compensation (δέ) for the loss of the first visit. He had, apparently, also resolved to adjourn for a while the time of his starting for Greece, and he speaks doubtfully about his going to Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 5, 8). Even these modifications betray a misgiving as to the conduct of the Church. The uncertainty about his going to Jerusalem arises from a doubt whether a sufficient sum would be raised to make it worth his while to accompany it (xvi. 4); and, although he assigns a good reason for protracting his stay at Ephesus, he says plainly that he has no inclination now to see his readers in passing (xvi. 7). In fact, the motives to which he afterwards ascribes his delay in coming, a desire to spare them, and a determination for his own sake not to come to them again in grief (2 Cor. i. 23, ii. 23), had already begun to operate. We know from the context in which these motives are mentioned that they had reference to the immoralities in the Church (ii. 5, 6), and just before he announced his change of plan he had not only told the Corinthians that they were notorious in this respect, but he had passed sentence upon one scandalous transgressor (1 Cor. v. 1-5). His reason for abandoning his first visit, therefore, is quite apparent, and we see again how this terrible heathen impurity within the Church was the main cause of alienation. Nevertheless, he still says positively that he will go to them, and that he may perhaps winter with them.

St. Paul himself gives us no more information about his intentions as to his third journey than is contained in the

Digitized by Google

clear statement of his two plans. But we meet, in 2 Cor. i. 12–18, some striking charges brought against him on the subject. "He had shewn levity; he had written what he did not mean; he had formed his plans with carnal cunning; he had written with regard to his coming a 'yes' and a 'no.'" In other words, he had made a positive affirmation that he would come, behind which lurked as positive an intention not to come, if he should find it inconvenient. These charges were most false, but they were not sheer imaginations. They had a sufficient semblance of a foundation in facts to induce him to refute them carefully, which he would never have done, had they not obtained circulation and some credence amongst his own adherents. Yet neither the difference between his two projects, nor anything else found in the First and Second Epistles furnishes ground for such imputations. He nowhere makes two statements about his visit so contradictory to one another as a "no" to a "yes." This points to the inference that 1 Cor. xvi. 5–8, was not his last word about this visit, but that he sent some further intimation which did actually seem to stand to his antecedent statements in the relation of a "no" to a "yes." If he did so, it was a written and not oral communication, for it was the equivocation of his *letters* that was imputed to him (2 Cor. i. 23). This gives rise to the important question whether there did not intervene between the First and Second Epistles *another letter which is no longer extant.* The argument is not to be lightly put aside. When present, he had said he would come. He had repeated this in the lost letter, and even promised two visits. He had again written in the First Epistle that he would certainly come. Where is the written "no" to this threefold "yes"? It is not found. On the other hand affairs at Corinth were so bad, especially in one particular, that they might well induce him to write and say that his coming now depended entirely upon improvement. If the interpretation of "I wrote this very thing," given in the note on ii. 3, be correct, we have an actual mention of the letter which contained the missing "no." What good reason he had for writing it may in some measure appear in considering the next point.

### iii. The Mission of Timothy.

We learn from Acts xix. 21–22 that, when St. Paul had resolved at Ephesus to go to Jerusalem after having "passed through *Macedonia and Achaia*," he sent Timothy (and Erastus) to Macedonia. In exact accordance with this, we see from the First Epistle that, having changed his first plan and resolved to go to Macedonia before going to Corinth (xvi. 5), he despatched Timothy to Corinth (iv. 17), *i.e.* by way of Macedonia. Timothy started therefore very nearly at the time when the First Epistle was written. He could not have been the bearer of it, because, in that case, the Apostle would scarcely have said: "if Timothy come" (xvi. 10). He was intended apparently to arrive shortly after the Epistle, when the Corinthians were considering its contents, with the general purport of which it may be presumed that Timothy was acquainted. His commission was (1 Cor. iv. 17) to support the statements and directions of the Epistle: to see, as far as possible, that they should be adopted and acted upon, and, if any opposition should arise, he was to point out that the letter contained no doctrine, counsel, or sentence, at variance with the Apostle's ways and teaching "in every Church." St. Paul gives him a special recommendation (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10), although he was well known to the Corinthians, having been a coadjutor in founding the Church. He had misgivings about Timothy's success, and thought it possible he might be treated with contempt: "Let no man therefore set him at nought" (xvi. 11). He even apprehended some personal risk: "See that he be with you without fear" (xvi. 10). He awaited the issue with anxious expectation: "conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me; for I look for him with the brethren." He had appealed to Apollos, and "exhorted him much" to share Timothy's task, but

Digitized by Google

Apollos absolutely declined (1 Cor. xvi. 12). All this proves that the mission was a very important one, that St. Paul and his colleagues thought the situation at Corinth very critical, and apprehended some outbreak. Now, when the Second Epistle was written, Timothy had not only returned to the Apostle, but is joined with him in the salutation (2 Cor. i. 1). Yet the letter contains *no mention of his visit to Corinth*, or its results, of his reception and treatment, or of his other experiences. No item of new intelligence can be distinctly traced to him, although in some parts of the Second Epistle the Apostle certainly *may* be proceeding upon information brought by Timothy. Still the chief news comes through Titus, whose reception and experiences *are* mentioned. In explanation some say that Timothy had reached and left Corinth before the First Epistle was delivered, a conjecture most unlikely in itself, and put out of the question by the intimate connection of his mission with the Epistle. Others say he never arrived at Corinth, either having given up the enterprise, or because something occurred which made it impossible for him to proceed. Yet it is to the last degree improbable that he should have taken upon himself to abandon such a commission, and, had any insuperable obstacle stopped him, some explanation of his failure must have been given. If the Apostle himself caused great discontent and incurred disrepute for delaying a promised visit, his emissary could not have omitted a visit, also promised, without an account being rendered of so unhappy a circumstance. But no such explanation is found, and the conclusion remains all but certain that Timothy had gone to Corinth, had seen what welcome the First Epistle met with, and had brought back his report to St. Paul. Yet it is patent that the mission had in some way miscarried, and this is implied in every explanation of it as yet offered. When the silence of the Second Epistle about its results is taken in connection with the mission and subsequent tidings of Titus (2 Cor. vii.), the most natural solution certainly is that the First Epistle had not been well received, and that the Church, having declined to comply with one or more of its injunctions, Timothy had immediately gone back to the Apostle to report his ill-success. If we ask upon what matter opposition was most likely to arise, the old rock of offence crops up, and the sentence upon the immoral offender at once suggests itself. The order that this sentence should be executed does not stand at all upon the same level with the other directions of the First Epstle. It was a strong blow dealt at the rooted habits of Corinthian life; it involved what was regarded as the ruin (2 Cor. vii. 2, ἐφθείραμεν) of one, about whom the Corinthians had been puffed up and had boasted (1 Cor. v. 2, 6), as though he had, by his lawless act, only asserted the natural liberty and rights of man against the narrow restrictions of the Gospel; and it was the only point which demanded prompt and decisive action. St. Paul must have known that the party whose persistent sensuality had already occasioned him grief and humiliation, and over whom he is still afraid that he shall have to mourn, even when he writes the Second Epistle (2 Cor. xii. 21), would not let his verdict pass unresisted; and hence arose his anxiety about Timothy. That there was *in fact* a strong resistance may be regarded as certain, because all that could be obtained even through the subsequent mission of Titus was a punishment less than St. Paul had prescribed, as plainly appears from 2 Cor. ii. 6. If, when the subject first came on for discussion, the opposition carried the day, and it was resolved that the judgment should not take effect, Timothy would have no other course than to rejoin the Apostle in Asia with that news. The Church would have failed to comply with the Christian obligation to purity, and would have set aside its founder's Apostolic authority. We can well understand how, in that case, grief and humiliation would become "affliction."

### iv. The Mission of Titus.

The intimations given us upon this subject are as follows. After the affliction in Asia, the Apostle, proceeding

Digitized by Google

from Ephesus to Greece, when he came to Troas had "no rest in his spirit," because he did not find Titus there on his way back from Corinth with tidings. His trouble was so great that he could not properly avail himself of a favourable opportunity of preaching the Gospel. His restlessness drove him on to Macedonia, but his distress, accompanied by fears, remained unabated until Titus came with news which brought him not only consolation but great joy (2 Cor. vii. 7, 13). Titus had been received at Corinth "with fear and trembling" (vii. 15), and *he* also derived from his visit consolation, refreshment of spirit, that is, relief after depression, and joy (2 Cor. vii. 7, 13). These were the immediate results of what he had seen and experienced, and of the effects of *a letter written by* the Apostle. We find also that St. Paul had boasted of the Corinthians to Titus (2 Cor. vii. 14). It appears then that Titus had not merely happened to be in Corinth on the arrival of the second Epistle, engaged in the work of the collection or other business, but that he had been expressly despatched, for the statements in 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13 and vii. 5, 6 shew that St. Paul had pre-arranged with him his return-route in order that, if he himself should quit Ephesus before Titus rejoined him, he might know on what track he should find his emissary, and obtain, at the earliest moment, the tidings for which he so painfully yearned. It is also clear that Titus's mission was in closest connection with the Corinthian crisis, because he shared the Apostle's anxiety, otherwise he could not have derived consolation and refreshment from his visit. To suppose that 2 Cor. vii. 14, refers to some general boast made at some previous time is to leave it out of all relation to the context. It shews that St. Paul had desired Titus to go to Corinth on a discouraging enterprise, and that Titus had manifested the same reluctance, which had been insuperable in Apollos, but which had been overcome in Titus by the Apostle expressing to him a favourable opinion of the Corinthians. Now in the First Epistle there is not a trace of this feverish and torturing anxiety about Corinthian affairs. It must have come on after that Epistle was penned and been caused by some new events. But it is fully accounted for by the failure above ascribed to Timothy, and it is not a groundless inference that Titus had taken up Timothy's mission in order to bring the Church, if possible, to a better mind, chiefly with regard to the sentence passed upon the immoral offender. This view is in remarkable agreement with the specific contents of 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11, which it is otherwise very difficult to explain. It makes it intelligible that Titus should have gone forth much depressed, although the Apostle had, in spite of his own distress, encouraged him with some hopeful commendation of the Corinthian Church. But Titus would certainly, if this be the true view of his mission, be armed with another letter from the Apostle, which could not fail to be written in severe terms and in much tribulation. It would be unreasonable to suppose that Titus, who was not so influential a person as Timothy in Corinth, could have produced the desired effect by his mere presence, while the Apostle remained mute and at a distance. It would be this letter and not the First Epistle which wrought the extraordinary revolution of feeling described in 2 Cor. vii., and the same letter would account for the silence of the Second Epistle about the results of Timothy's mission, because they would be spoken of in it, and not in the Second Epistle. The presentation of such a despatch at Corinth would be a good reason, after what had occurred, for Titus being received "with fear and trembling," whereas, otherwise, such a reception remains wholly unexplained.

v. Further indications of a Letter written between the dates of the First and Second Epistles.[1]

The Apostle has to meet more than

[1] The reader who wishes to see this subject fully discussed must consult Bleek's Einleitung i. d. N. Test. pp. 402–406; Theolog. Stud. u. Krit. 1830. 3, pp. 625–632; but especially Klöpper, Exeg.-krit. Untersuch. ü. d. 2 Kor. Brief, and Kommentar, Einl. pp. 42–56.

Digitized by Google

once in the Second Epistle the charge of habitual self-commendation, wich 2 Cor. iii. 1 seems to connect with his letters. This, like the charge of saying "yes" and "no," has no adequate foundation in the First Epistle. On the contrary that Epistle contains some strong expressions of a most unmistakable humility, as in iv. 9–13, and especially in xv. 8, 9. But if the Corinthians had proved refractory, and a further letter was sent, it would be very natural that he should assert himself somewhat strongly and insist upon what was due to him as their spiritual father, as well as upon other grounds; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 8.

There are two marked allusions in the Second Epistle to a previous letter. We read in 2 Cor. ii. 1–4, that the Apostle had written this letter for the purpose of avoiding a second visit of grief, which grief would have been caused by the necessity of inflicting in person punishment (2 Cor. i. 23) for sinful conduct, and also that he wrote it "out of much affliction and anguish of heart, with many tears." From 2 Cor. vii. 7–12 we learn that he had repented for a while of ever having written it, because of the excessive pain which he knew it would cause his readers. The effect which it did, in fact, produce upon them was a tumult of mixed feelings, grief, repentence, fear, an anxiety to clear themselves, indignation against some person or persons, a wish to take satisfaction for some evil conduct, together with a warm zeal and affection for the Apostle (vii. 7, 11). That both these allusions refer to one and the same letter is beyond controversy, because in unbroken connection with both, he proceeds to speak of the notable offender against purity. It was presumed, until a recent date, that the letter in question was the First Epistle, but there are great difficulties in the way of this identification. It is not easy to understand how it could be said of a letter of such compass and variety as the First Epistle, that its object was to spare the writer a second visit of grief. Neither is the general strain of it such as a man would use who felt that it would be so painful for him to meet his readers in person that he must make his visit conditional upon a rectification of their conduct. What modifications he did make in the plan of his journey, and why he made them, we have seen (p. 379), but still he speaks positively of his coming, and mentions the time and possible duration of his visit, which was not brief (1 Cor. iv. 18; xi. 34; xvi. 2, 5). Again, it is scarcely comprehensible that St. Paul should have said, even in a moment of strong excitement, of so costly a monument of Christian truth as the First Epistle is, that he repented for a while of ever having written it. Further, if these passages in the Second Epistle allude to the First, the agony of distress and the many tears with which he wrote are very perplexing. There is no actual expression of any such extreme trouble as this in the whole range of the First Epistle; and one expositor, who does not acknowledge an intermediate letter, says ingenuously, that in the exercise of a wise self-control, the Apostle "put such chains upon his feelings, that his letter reflects no true image of them." The general tone of the Epistle is deliberate and self-possessed throughout, and many details are discussed with calm minuteness. There are also special passages, such as 1 Cor. i. 7, 8 and xi. 2, which, with the greetings of love in the concluding chapter, seem quite at variance with "much affliction and anguish of heart" and "many tears." The passage usually appealed to in justification of these strong phrases is 1 Cor. v. 1–7, 13, and, without doubt, it cost the Apostle not a little to write it. Yet there is neither in it nor behind it any trace of a grief melting into tears. It is a brief, decisive verdict, delivered under a solemn and stern sense of duty. It has all the dispassionateness, dignity, and firmness of a judicial sentence.

It is impossible to read 2 Cor. vii. without being convinced that Titus narrated to the Apostle what he had witnessed in Corinth with his own eyes and the agitation which he so vividly described was clearly one of fresh and newly-kindled feelings. This is comprehensible, if the letter which produced it

Digitized by Google

(2 Cor. vii. 8) had just been brought by Titus himself and was one of severe reproach and menace for grievous immoral conduct of which the case so often mentioned was only one extreme example, as well as for rebellion against St. Paul's apostolic authority, and, further, the particular emotions enumerated in vii. 7, 11 are one and all completely accounted for. But that the First Epistle, which the Church must have had in its possession several weeks, at the least, should have brought on this paroxysm of excitement just when Titus was present, seems most improbable, even if its contents were of a nature to operate in such a manner.

The force of these reasons for thinking that there was a second missing letter is and will perhaps continue to be variously estimated. Some assume an *à priori* improbability and even entertain an antipathy against the view. Yet there seems great reasonableness in Calvin's remark upon 1 Cor. v. 9:—"That letter of which he speaks is not extant. Nor is there any doubt that *many* have dropped out of existence; but it is enough that there survive for us as many as the providence of the Lord has deemed sufficient." When the theory was first advanced, some good expositors, like Neander and Olshausen, adopted it, others, like Billroth, conceding that much was to be said in its favour, nevertheless hesitated to accept it without further investigation. It has recently been tested with great care, and is clearly gaining ground amongst competent judges. Its strong claim, independently of positive arguments in its favour, consists in the service which it renders as a key to the interpretation of the Second Epistle. It fits the lock. It lets in light upon many passages otherwise obscure; and in others, which have been vaguely interpreted, it discloses a pointed meaning. How far it does this can only be seen in the course of the Commentary.

It should be no matter of surprise that such a letter has perished. From the nature of the case, it could not have been a long one, and neither writer nor readers could greatly desire to preserve a memorial of the most painful passage that ever occurred between them.

### vi. The Judaizers.

The Apostle's *grief*, properly so called, proceeded from the spreading of heathen immorality, but this was complicated by an evil of a very different kind, though not of less magnitude. It is plain from the large polemical sections of the Epistle that Judaism had assumed a far more developed and organic form than it wears in the First Epistle, and an attitude of declared and malignant hostility to St. Paul. The immediate causes of this seem to have been: 1. The intrusion of Judaizing teachers from abroad, some of whom must have been sheer impostors, whilst some brought with them letters of commendation, apparently from the Mother-Church at Jerusalem; 2. The repugnance of the Jewish believers to the heathen dissoluteness, which they thought the Apostle either unable or unwilling to check. This feeling, which must have been aggravated by what had taken place with reference to the recent gross case, would dispose them favourably towards the stricter discipline of the Judaizers and tend to alienate them from the Apostle. The more respectable of the new comers may have been originally Pharisees (Acts xv. 5) whose Pharisaism had not yielded to the spirit of the Christianity which they had adopted. Some of them had clearly been disciples of the Lord himself. It is easy to understand how such men might, by the outward decorum of their lives and perhaps by a Pharisaic zeal of proselytism, prompting them to an active propaganda of that form of the Truth which was established at Jerusalem, win esteem, and for the purpose of preaching abroad, might obtain letters from men of some standing at Jerusalem, testifying that they were what they claimed to be. On their arrival at Corinth, they would find a licentiousness such as they had never before witnessed and, having already a vehement antipathy against St. Paul and his work (Acts xxi. 20, 21), they would at once conclude

Digitized by Google

that he was the *fons et origo mali.* In this view the previous Jewish opponents whom St. Paul encountered on his first visit to Corinth (Acts xviii. 6, 13) would of course concur, and whatever their views of Christianity might be, would at once make common cause with any opposition to him. We may also fairly suppose that others who were members of the Church, but of whom we learn (1 Cor. vii. 18; ix. 1 ff) that they wished to impose circumcision on the heathen converts, and that they questioned St. Paul's Apostleship, joined the intruders, although there is no reason to think that they were numerous. Probably not a few Jewish believers, estranged recently, followed their example. This formidable union of hostile elements immediately organized a system of opposition to the Apostle.

i. They met his Gospel by a counter-gospel, which turned primarily upon Christ's person and secondarily upon the Mosaic law (ch. iii.). They recognized in Christ only the Son of David, born under the law, himself observing the law, and offering the blessings of the Messiah's Kingdom to Jews alone. They estimated Christ only according to his outward circumstances and manifestation in the flesh. This is what St. Paul terms a "Christ after the flesh." They did not deny that Christ died and rose again and ascended into heaven. But they looked upon these things as bare historic facts. The crucifixion was not to them what it was to St. Paul, a stripping away from Christ of the flesh and all its restrictions and the sole foundation of reconciliation with God, not for the Jews alone, but for all men. The resurrection and ascension had no doctrinal significance for them. They thought that through these Christ changed the region of his existence, and no more. To St. Paul the crucifixion and resurrection were the stages through which the Saviour passed to a new, spiritual glorified form of life, of which new life all Christ's true followers were capable of partaking through faith in Him. In this form St. Paul himself had seen Him, and therefore preached, in contrast to their Christ after the flesh, a Christ who is spirit, the Lord of glory, not merely the Son of David, but the Son of God.

Further, as the Judaizers considered Christ to be a pattern to men only as he lived and acted during his earthly career, they declared it necessary for all men, in order to be saved, to obey the Mosaic Law as He had done. The Mosaic Law therefore, together with the Mosaic Ministry, which they considered to be continued in their own persons, were of eternal validity and glory. They did not deny that the Gentiles could be saved, but they contended that obedience to the Law was for them, as for Jews, not only the rule of life, but *the means of salvation.* All this is quite clear from the repeated statement that they adulterated the word of God (ii. 17; iv. 2), from the whole tenor of chap. iii. from iv. 4; v. 18–21; xi. 4, as well as from other passages. The theory that a man received, through faith in Christ, forgiveness of sins, a righteousness of God, union with Christ, died to self and the flesh, had a new principle of life, became a new creature, a son of God, was made free, was gradually assimilated to Christ's glory, possessed in the in-dwelling Spirit an earnest of the future inheritance—all this was to them unintelligible (2 Cor. iv. 3).

ii. They assailed the Apostle personally at all points in order to drive him out of Corinth, though it was part of that Gentile world which God had originally assigned to him, and he had made it his own domain by right of spiritual conquest.

They ridiculed the sources from which he professed to have derived his Gospel. Because he ascribed it to direct communications from the glorified Saviour (Gal. i. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3), they said it was the product of madness. All his ecstatic states, his visions and revelations were only illustrations of his unsound mind (v. 13). He had created a Gospel out of his own disordered imagination, and preached merely himself (iii. 5; iv. 5), going hither and thither and deceiving the world.

They denied the genuineness of his Apostleship. They had known Christ personally in the flesh (x. 7). He had not. They had letters of recommendation. He had none. They were



Digitized by Google

Hebrews, Israelites, of the seed of Abraham. His very sufferings and persecutions proved that he was the object of God's disapprobation (iv. 7). As to the Churches founded by him, to which he pointed as the fruits of his ministry and proofs of its validity, what were they but nests of iniquity? He had himself no confidence in the legitimacy of his office, because he did not use the acknowledged privilege of taking the means of subsistence from those whom he taught (xi. 7).

With a view to overthrowing his personal influence, they assailed his character unsparingly with charges of levity, carnal wisdom, self-commendation, malversation of money (vii. 1; viii. 20), usurpation of lordship over the community, partizanship, personal animosity, cowardice, harshness in his letters, and the like.

His own view of these men St. Paul sketches in a few bold strokes. They sophisticated God's word. They were pseudo-Apostles, deceitful workers. They resorted to secret practices of shame, and to crafty wickedness. They were carnal boasters. They plumed themselves upon mere external things, not upon anything that belonged to the real man of the heart (v. 12). They were pretenders of unbounded self-complacency and arrogance, claiming the fruits of other men's labours (xi. 15); enslavers, devourers, plunderers of the community, self-exalters, men of violence (xi. 20). They were blinded by the god of this world (iv. 4); were ministers of Satan, who, exercising their master's power of transfiguring himself into an angel of light, put on the outward disguise merely of ministers of righteousness and Apostles of Christ.

All the accusations against the Apostle are traceable to this party, as is shewn both by their nature and by the connection in which they are mentioned as well in the earlier apologetic portions of the Epistle (i.–ix.) as in the final combat *à outrance* in x.–xii. 18. The earlier self-defence is indeed more moderate in tone, because he is speaking to the main body of the Church with a view to reconciliation, while in his last passage of arms with those of whom he had no hope, he uses unsparing language. The agreement, however, of several expressions distinctly shews that he was dealing with the same antagonists in both cases. Compare iii. 5 ff. with xi. 22; v. 12 with x. 7; v. 16 with xi. 18; iv. 4 with xi. 3, 14–15; iv. 1–16 with x. 1, 10, 11, and other passages.

Such were the ringleaders of the systematized and unscrupulous Judaic combination which St. Paul has to encounter in the Second Epistle. The Cephas party of the First Epistle is not even named. Its members may have been in some measure absorbed in the general league, or may have been amongst those whom the Apostle hoped to regain, which is more probable. But the Christ party has not wholly disappeared, for not only did the entire conflict turn upon the person of Christ, but there is evidence (x. 7) that the adversaries considered themselves to belong to Christ by a special bond, to which St. Paul could lay no claim. This was the bond involved in their having been personal disciples of the Saviour, or having received their teaching from those who had been his disciples, and in modelling their outward lives strictly after the example of Christ in the flesh. It would seem that amongst the sections which divided the Church, the intruders found the party of Christ to approximate most closely to the views and rule of life professed by themselves and therefore adopted its designation.

It is quite an untenable theory that they were acting with the approbation of the Apostles at Jerusalem, to whom there is no reference in xi. 5, xii. 11. Their teaching was such as no Apostle could have maintained. Their methods were so dishonest, and their treatment of St. Paul so iniquitous, that it requires all the well-known bigoted and fanatical hatred of Jews against any one who depreciated the Mosaic institutions to explain how *even they* could have resorted to them. All that we know of St. Peter, the great representative of "the Gospel of the circumcision," and his relation to St. Paul, either from the Acts, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, or the Epistle

Digitized by Google

to the Galatians, renders it impossible to impute to him the remotest complicity in this nefarious conspiracy. If St. Paul had been aware that, in denouncing his Corinthian opponents, he was also assailing the original Apostles, how he could expect that his collection on behalf of the poor Saints in Judæa would help to maintain a good understanding between himself and the Church at Jerusalem would remain an insoluble enigma.

## II. The Date of the Second Epistle.

The date of the First Epistle was the early spring of A.D. 57. The Second was written in the same year, but the exact interval between them is not easily determined. It depends mainly upon the length of the Apostle's stay in Asia after he despatched the First Epistle. He had intended to remain in Ephesus until Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). Whether the riot of Demetrius took place at the great festival of Diana in May, and whether, whenever it took place, it precipitated the Apostle's departure or not, is quite uncertain. He continued in Asia long enough for Timothy to go by Macedonia to Corinth and rejoin him, and then for Titus to go to Corinth, and, returning by Macedonia, to be due in Troas. But how long these journeys occupied cannot be computed with precision. Wieseler thinks that St. Paul cannot have met Titus earlier than two months after their parting. He must have waited a while at Troas, for 2 Cor. ii. 12 does not imply that he did not preach the Gospel there at all, and there was naturally some risk of missing Titus on the way if he started before his arrival. On the whole the circumstances indicate a longer sojourn in Asia than he had contemplated, and with this his unqualified statement that he had preached in Ephesus "three years" agrees (Acts xx. 31). He arrived in that town towards the end of a year (see Acts xviii. 18–xix. 1, and Wieseler), and if he stayed no later than Pentecost A.D. 57, he was only there 2½ years at the most, which is too short a period for the precise language of Acts xx. 31. (Note the prominent position of τριετίαν in the original, and the words "night and day.") There was further waiting for Titus in Macedonia, which left on his mind a deep recollection of painful expectation, and he then had to write the letter. But there was still time for Titus to bear it to Corinth, and complete the work of the collection before the Apostle arrived (2 Cor. viii. 17, ix. 3). During his stay in Macedonia he went "over those parts," and gave the Churches much exhortation (Acts xx. 2), and he must have reached Corinth late in the year, for having remained only three months (Acts xx. 3), he proceeded to Philippi, and arrived shortly before Easter, which he kept at that place. An earlier approximate date than October A.D. 57 can scarcely be assigned to the Epistle. This interval between it and the First is neither much more nor much less than is required for the intermediate events, and for the marked change which the situation in Corinth had clearly undergone. No certain inference can be drawn from the phrase "a year ago" in viii. 10, ix. 2, because it is not known according to which of several calendars the Apostle reckoned. If he counted according to the Jewish civil year, which began about the end of September, the expression would accord with the view that he wrote about October.

## III. The Integrity of the Epistle.

There is no evidence whatever that this Epistle was ever regarded by antiquity otherwise than as one letter. Attempts to divide or distribute it into two or more were made by Semler (1767) and Weber (1798–1806). Their arbitrary views may be seen in Credner's Einleitung i. d. N. T. Even Wieseler's opinion that the Epistle, though one in substance, is divisible with reference to the times of writing, the first part (i. 1—vii. 1) having been composed before, and the remainder after the arrival of Titus, has found little support, and with good reason, for 2 Cor. ii. 14–17 sufficiently shows that the Apostle was cognizant of the news of Titus from the beginning of the letter. The question of integrity was therefore considered a settled one, until, in 1830,



Digitized by Google

Hausrath wrote "The Four-chapter Letter of Paul to the Corinthians," in which he contended that the last four chapters were a separate composition, and constituted, in fact, the intermediate letter between the First and Second Epistles. He has been effectually answered by Klöpper. Whether a letter is an organic whole or not does not depend upon its contents merely, but upon its contents viewed in their relation to the situation of the writer and his readers. If the subject-matter and the circumstances agree, it is sufficient to establish the unity of the writing; and there is, undoubtedly, such an agreement in this case, notwithstanding the disparity of length between the sections of the Epistle, a seeming disharmony in their tone, some abrupt transitions, and some obscurity in the connection of ideas. No one can expect a letter penned under strong conflicting emotions, and the immediate pressure of complex circumstances, to have the symmetry and clearness of a classical composition.

### IV. The Effect produced by the Epistle.

The effect produced upon its readers by this most remarkable Apostolic writing is not recorded. The passage in the Acts (xx. 2, 3), which tells us that St. Paul's long-promised visit was at length paid, only says that "he came into Greece and there abode three months." When we consider the strong reaction in his favour as described by Titus in ch. vii., we cannot but think that the extraordinary "weight and power" of this Epistle, written expressly to take the favourable tide at its height, produced a deep impression, and this is confirmed by the mere duration of his sojourn at Corinth. It is more strongly corroborated by the fact that during his visit he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, in which many momentous topics receive a calm, profound, sustained treatment, shewing that he had recovered that rest of spirit and flesh of which he had recently been so sorely destitute. The collection also came to a happy issue, for he had said (1 Cor. xvi. 4) that if the amount subscribed "should be worthy of his going also," the Corinthian bearers of it should accompany him to Jerusalem, and we find (Rom. xvi. 26) that it was found worthy of his going. So far the letter bore its proper fruits, but his original Jewish persecutors (Acts xviii. 6, 12, 13). were not likely to be mollified by such a passage as 2 Cor. iii. 6—18. His Judaizing adversaries also would naturally remain implacable after his polemic against them in 2 Cor. x. 1—xii. 18. We can imagine the malignant rage with which they would witness a three months' demolition of their satanic strongholds (2 Cor. x. 4). But so long as he was in the bosom of the Church, he was safe, and it was only on his departure that an unsuccessful attempt was made to take his life (Acts xx. 3). If we look beyond the record of Scripture towards the end of the first century, we are again presented with a dark picture of the Corinthian community. Some passages in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Church of Corinth (see especially chapters iii. and xxx.) shew that there existed even a more extravagant spirit of faction and insubordination than we find in St. Paul's Epistles and almost as bad a state of moral corruption. Certainly a fresh race of men had sprung up, but it would seem that even an Apostle must not expect the fruits of his labours to outlive the generation amidst which he has toiled. Perhaps no influence could have been lasting in so mixed and volatile a population. It was, however, a glorious achievement, if the much people which God had in that city (Acts xviii. 10) entered, under the Apostle's guidance, into their blessed rest. If their children did not, like their fathers, remember him in all things (1 Cor. xi. 2) and keep the precepts which he delivered unto them in this Second Epistle, yet the Epistle itself, to which the words of the great Greek historian have been happily applied (κτῆμα ἐς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν σύγκειται, Thuc. i. 22) has become a possession of all men for all times; has done and will continue to

Digitized by Google

do its divine work, accomplishing that which God pleases, and prospering in that whereto he sent it (Isaiah lv. 11) through the long march of all the ages.

### V. Commentaries.

Of the manifold works upon this Epistle it is only necessary to mention here two or three of the less familiar and more recent to which the writer of the present commentary is more or less indebted. Osiander's work (1847. 1857) has scarcely met with due recognition. Its usefulness is perhaps impaired by its fulness, by its criticism of too many views, and by a tendency to amalgamate two or more interpretations into one; but it contains the results of wide and conscientious research. The portion of Hofmann's Heilige Schrift Neuen Testamentes, which treats of this Epistle, was reissued in 1877 in an improved form, and is a very searching commentary. But the most valuable of recent contributions to the literature of the Corinthian Epistles has been made in the very able writings of Klöpper (1869. 1874). Some of his conclusions must await the test of time, but he has undoubtedly thrown great light both upon the Second Epistle as a whole and upon particular points. With regard to textual criticism, both Hofmann and Klöpper are rather unduly swayed by internal evidence.

Digitized by Google

# THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# CORINTHIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

3 *The apostle encourageth them against troubles, by the comforts and deliverances which God had given him, as in all his afflictions,* 8 *so particularly in his late danger in Asia.* 12 *And calling both his own conscience and their's to witness of his sincere manner of preaching the immutable truth of the gospel,* 15 *he excuseth his not coming to them, as proceeding not of lightness, but of his lenity towards them.*

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy *our* brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia:

2 Grace *be* to you and peace from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.

3 Blessed *be* God, even the Father

---

CHAP. I. 1. See 1 Cor. i. 1. Timothy is very suitably made accessory to the Epistle, not only because he had helped to found the Corinthian Church, but also because he had just encountered a repulse at its hands. St. Paul wished to intimate that he held him free from blame with regard to his ill-success, as well as that Timothy himself was so far from being alienated that he became a party to this conciliatory letter.

*our brother.*] The brotherhood refers both to the Corinthians and St. Paul. Towards the former it was the general brotherhood of the faith; towards the latter it was also a brotherhood in missionary labour and in the foundation of the Corinthian Church, but not in the Apostolic office. Timothy is nowhere called an Apostle, probably because he had never seen the risen Saviour, and therefore lacked one of the qualifications of Apostleship (Acts i. 22; 2 Cor. ix. 1). It does not at all follow that he was the scribe of this letter because he is mentioned in the address. Tertius the scribe is *not* mentioned in the address to the Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 22), and there is no reason to suppose that the *two* accessory authors of the Epistles to the Thessalonians were *both* scribes.

Achaia in classical times was the northern strip of the Peloponnese. It afterwards denoted the Roman Province, comprising Hellas proper, with the adjacent islands. St. Paul however does not use it in this wider sense, for in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 he calls the household of Stephanas "the firstfruits of Achaia," which would be an incorrect expression, if the Roman Province were meant, because Dionysius the Areopagite of Athens and many other Athenians had been converted before Stephanas and his family at Corinth, and would have a better claim to the title "firstfruits of Achaia." The name Achaia therefore is either used in its early restricted sense or means the Peloponnese.

*all the saints.*] This seems to imply a considerable body of believers. They are however addressed as individuals, not as Churches. There was, no doubt, a Judaizing propaganda carried on from Corinth in the neighbouring districts, and the dissoluteness of the metropolis naturally extended itself to the vicinity. It is not surprising therefore that the address of a letter bearing expressly upon the circumstances of Corinth should include also the believers of other places, closely connected with it who were more or less in similar danger. St. Paul himself must have visited other towns in Achaia besides Cenchreæ.

2. To his salutations St. Paul usually appends some praise (Rom. i. 8; Eph. i. 15; Phil. i. 3–8, &c., &c.), and that his withholding it here is significant, appears from the like silence in the Epistle to the Galatian Churches, which, like that of Corinth, had fallen into grievous errors. In v. 6 he is addressing the better-minded part of the community. When we compare the warm eulogy in 1 Cor. i. 4–8, it is clear how much matters had changed for the worse, in the interval between the First and Second Epistles, for although Titus had reported decided symptoms of improvement, the Apostle could

Digitized by Google

of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort;

4 Who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.

5 For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ.

---

not yet look forward with perfect confidence.

**3.** Thanksgiving for deliverance from the affliction in Asia. For proof that this affliction was his overpowering distress at the lamentable state of the Church of Corinth as reported to him by Timothy, see note at end of chapter. The tidings fell upon him like a prostrating calamity, and the deliverance was the partial reformation which had since been wrought. The extremity of his trouble and the intensity of his gratitude appear in the reiteration of the word 'comfort' ten times in five verses, and of 'affliction' four times in four verses. The force of this repetition is unhappily lost in the A. V. by a needless alternation of the terms 'comfort' and 'consolation,' and, on the other hand, of 'tribulation,' 'trouble,' and 'affliction' for the uniform expressions of the original.

*Blessed be God even the Father.*] It is not quite certain whether the rendering should be: 'Blessed be God and the Father of our Lord,' or 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord.' In other introductory passages (Rom. i. 7, Cor. i. 3, Gal. i. 3, Eph. i. 2, Phil. i. 2, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 2, 1 Tim. i. 2, Philem. i. 3) God is spoken of in His relation to men rather than to Christ. On the other hand, we find in Eph. i. 17, "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" (cf. John xx. 17, Matt. xxvii. 46), and St. Paul had just used the very expression of the verse before us in Eph. i. 3, where the A. V. renders "*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord,*" as it does also in 1 Pet. i. 3, which translation the original here favours. "The Father of commiserations" or "pityings" would be slightly more correct than 'the Father of mercies.' God is so designated because of His *manifold dealings* of pity, and He is the God of all comfort because there is *no* kind of true comfort which he cannot and does not administer.

**4.** That God is rightly blessed under these designations is illustrated by what the Apostle has recently gone through and by the use to which God intends him to apply his experiences. Whatever may be the form or weight of his affliction, God furnishes the appropriate comfort, to the end that he may be able to administer the comfort which he has himself so received to other sufferers, whatever may be the form or weight of their affliction. The terms are general, and capable of wide application, but a special drift underlies them. The comfort is that which he derived from the tidings of Titus, as is proved by the similar language of vii. 4. "I am filled with the *comfort . . . in all our affliction.*" In accordance with God's purpose this comfort should now re-act upon the Corinthians and solace them in their "fear and trembling" (vii. 15), their "grief" (vii. 11), their "lamentation" (vii. 7) for the evils which they had partly caused and partly tolerated. It is only this specific sense that gives their proper force to the last words of the verse, which imply that the comfort of the Apostle and his readers is *one and the same.* See how he re-imparts to them in chapter vii. the selfsame comfort which had been imparted to him.

**5.** States the principle upon which comfort is obtained in his own case. The endurance of the sufferings of Christ in overflowing abundance involves as its correlative the reception of a commensurate comfort through Christ. The connecting link between the sufferings and the comfort is Christ, but with a modification. The Apostle's sufferings are those *of* Christ; his comfort is received *through* Christ. The "sufferings of Christ" are those which are *identical* with Christ's. This identity consists in their springing from the same cause and serving the same end. Whatever set itself in antagonism to Christ or hindered Him in accomplishing God's work of redeeming the world from sin and evil, caused Him suffering. The forms of opposition were manifold, but they were all referable to one source,—Satan. Christ's victory over this opposition, which could only be won by sufferings culminating in death, was the accomplishment of his meritorious work of Redemption. But this was not the *complete* end, which God and Christ had in view, for there remained *the application of* redemption to mankind. This work, which is also, in a most true sense, Christ's work, He committed to his ministers and followers, and, whatever sufferings they endure in encountering opposition, are *Christ's* sufferings. The difference between Redemption and its application involves the essential difference between Christ's sufferings in His own person and His sufferings in the person of His ministers. The sufferings which *procured* Redemption were sacrificial; those which

Digitized by Google

6 And whether we be afflicted, *it is* for your consolation and salvation, which [1]is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer: or whether we be comforted, *it is* for your consolation and salvation.

7 And our hope of you *is* stedfast,

[1] Or, *is wrought*.

---

*apply* redemption are not, for the cross exhausted sacrifice. But as the work of Christ's ministers is the continuance and the supplement of Christ's work, so their sufferings have the unspeakable dignity of being the continuance and the supplement of His sufferings, Col. i. 24. Some explain this communion by the present relation of the members to the Head in Christ's mystical body. But the idea of Christ in His glorified state suffering with His suffering members is questionable. This mystical relation to Christ glorified is rather the foundation of the *comfort*, which is the *correlative* of the sufferings. As Christ's sufferings and death led to resurrection, glory, and power, so there flows from God "through Christ" thus glorified, in virtue of the vital bond uniting the Head and the members, a superabundant stream of living help and power which brings with it comfort and victory over afflictions.

There was certainly one striking point of identity between Christ's sufferings in His own person and His sufferings in the person of St. Paul. Christ suffered and died at the hands of the Jews because he offered to the whole world a spiritual salvation by faith, not merely a legal and national one to Jews only. It was the same Pharisaic and intensely Jewish spirit which brought upon St. Paul deadly hatred, persecution, and continual peril of life, because he also preached a spiritual and universal salvation. But the sufferings which sprung from this source did not exhaust his "sufferings of Christ," for these arose, in Corinth at any rate, quite as much from the opposition of heathenism as of Judaism.

A secondary part of the sense may be that, whereas his enemies pointed to his afflictions as proofs of God's displeasure against him, they were, in truth, together with the comfort which never failed to accompany them, only proofs of his complete solidarity with Christ.

**6.** There is reason to think that the right reading and rendering of this difficult verse is:—"But whether we are afflicted, it is on behalf of your comfort and salvation: or are comforted, it is on behalf of your comfort, which takes effect in the (patient) endurance of the same sufferings, which we also suffer." In ver. 4 he pointed out God's purpose in comforting him *in* affliction, and in ver. 5 the link which always connected *with* his affliction a commensurate comfort. He now takes the affliction and the comfort apart and shews, according to the divine purpose of each severally, by how close a bond he is united with his readers. The statement presents a picture of the real Apostle very different from the false portrait which his enemies had sketched of him at Corinth. He is not a harsh and heartless pretender to lordship over the members of the Church, but one who suffered and was solaced equally for their sake. The language is general, but was plainly prompted by recent facts. The sinful conduct of the Corinthians, in disregarding his Apostolic order to condemn a gross immorality, and in allowing his calumniators to alienate them from him, had caused his affliction. "Out of" this "much affliction and anguish of heart" he had taken measures which God had blessed, and although their firstfruit for the Corinthians was grief, the fruit of the grief was a repentance, which was not to be repented of (ch. vii. 8, 9), because it was the only gateway to comfort for their grief. They had also imperilled their salvation because no one who was unchaste, or defended or tolerated unchastity in the Church, or who set at nought Christ's Apostle, could keep his place in the Kingdom of Heaven. How apprehensive he still was with regard to some of his converts appears from 2 Cor. xi. 3. However he had succeeded in bringing the better-disposed to a sense of their danger, and hence he speaks in ch. vii. 10 of a "repentance unto *salvation*." So his affliction worked for their comfort and *salvation*. But the reformation having been so far effected and the Apostle thereby comforted, he no longer alludes to any doubt about their salvation. Upon this point he is reassured. In faith they were standing (ch. i. 24) and, with regard to their conduct, he rejoiced that he had confidence in them in everything (ch. vii. 16). So he can state that the object of his comfort is to minister to their *comfort*, without further mention of their salvation. The condition under which the comfort ministered by him would be effectually realised, was that the recipients should patiently bear the same sufferings with himself, *i.e.* the sufferings of Christ. They must hold out, for the true Gospel's sake and for their own salvation, against opposition and persecution, whether from Jews, Judaizers, or heathen libertines.

**7.** Whether they will do this he is not sure, but he has a stedfast hope that they will, based upon his knowledge that just as they are in communion with him in his

Digitized by Google

knowing, that as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so *shall ye be* also of the consolation.

8 For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life:

9 But we had the [1]sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead:

10 Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver *us;*

11 Ye also helping together by prayer for us, that for the gift *be-*

[1] Or, *answer.*

---

sufferings, so are they also in his comfort He knew, what was indeed obvious, that those, amongst whom a reaction in his favour had set in, became at once objects of the same enmity with himself, both from the Jewish and Judaizing and the heathenizing party in Corinth. He knew also that the comfort which he received through Christ in *his* sufferings would flow effectually to them in *theirs*, and he hoped that it would sustain them. The context seems to compel us to adhere closely to the idea of a communion of suffering and comfort *with the Apostle*, which was, however, through him also a communion with Christ. If such a communion could be maintained, it involved the triumph of St. Paul's cause, and therefore of Christ's in Corinth.

8. The occasion of these reflections about affliction and comfort. It is mentioned as a thing known to the readers who had become acquainted with it through Titus, and the letter which he bore. It might have been hazardous to begin a conciliatory Epistle with observations about distress brought upon the writer by the readers. But he does so, *for* he would not have them ignorant of what he had suffered, when Timothy brought to him in Asia his report of the grievous state of affairs in Corinth. Naturally he would not have them ignorant of it, because it exactly enabled him to shew how deeply and affectionately he was interested in them. The effect upon him had been overpowering. "*Out of measure*" expresses the absolute excessiveness of the load, while "*above strength*" denotes its relative excess over his power to bear it. What we know of St. Paul's moral and physical susceptibilities takes away all appearance of exaggeration from his statement that he fell into despair even of living. It only requires a little reflection in order to understand how a threatening break-down of his missionary labours, which had seemed to be so prosperous in a great centre of civilization in that heathen world to which he was especially sent, would be felt by him like a death-blow. His sufferings of Christ seemed to be reaching the climax of death.

9. But it did not come to that issue, for he now describes the frame of mind which he had attained and continually preserved, and which led to the opposite of death, viz., resurrection. The verse may be thus paraphrased:—'But so far as we ourselves and our power of delivering ourselves are concerned, whenever, in any crisis of life and death, the question comes before us, whether we are to live or die, we have got, and keep (perf. of an aor. form) in ourselves, as the standing answer (ἀπόκριμα), the verdict of death.' The object of maintaining this standing answer is permanently to destroy self-trust, which could only precipitate death, and foster trust in God who raises the dead, as he did Christ, and therefore could deliver Christ's minister, when on the point of dying in Christ's cause. It is implied that the Apostle, in his extremity, committed himself and the issue to God.

10. His trust was not in vain, for God delivered him from so great a death. Had he died with the sense of a signal defeat, inflicted by the enemies of the Gospel, and the ruin of his mission among the gentiles, it would have been a death "so great" that none could have been more terrible to him. But God revived him, and he made a new effort, "yet not he, but Christ" living in him. The result was that the Church of Corinth had been plucked like a brand from the burning. His renewed energy and its success were the deliverance. It continued still, for he had reason to believe that his influence and the cause of the true Gospel were re-establishing themselves in Corinth, and he hopes (ver. 7), though he cannot be sure, that this will last. He was well aware that his victory in Corinth was not yet won. The next verse, however, renders it probable that "doth deliver" and "will deliver" are not to be restricted wholly to his Corinthian difficulties, but have a wider reference to his present and future work amongst the gentiles. The expression "without were fightings" in ch. vii. 5, seems to imply that he met with opposition in Macedonia, and he may have felt that God was delivering him from that also even at the time of his writing.

Digitized by Google

*stowed* upon us by the means of many persons thanks may be given by many on our behalf.

12 For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward.

13 For we write none other things unto you, than what ye read or acknowledge; and I trust ye shall acknowledge even to the end;

14 As also ye have acknowledged us in part, that we are your re-

---

**11.** His further deliverance depended, in part, upon the co-operation of the Corinthians themselves, which he assumes that he will have in the form of intercessory prayer. It is implied that the substance of the prayer was, that God would bestow upon him so powerful a gift of the life of Christ as should ensure the triumph of his cause with all its attendant blessings. Such a special gift as this he properly calls a Charisma. The object of the prayer was that this gift should be made matter of thanksgiving to God from the many to whose inestimable benefit it would redound. This end and aim is quite in accordance with the Apostle's view of thanksgiving as he states it in other passages. The glory of God is with him the final cause of all things (see particularly Rom. xv. 5, 6, and cf. 2 Cor. iv. 15) and, in contemplating multitudes in the act of rendering this glory by thanking God on his behalf, he expresses his satisfaction in the fulness of his language. "By means of many," who through their prayers help the Apostle's continued deliverance, seems the right rendering and explanation (διὰ πολλῶν). But "*by means of many persons*" (A.V.) cannot be the correct translation of ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων, which describes merely those *from* whom the thanks proceed, i.e. further multitudes who, by the prayers of the Corinthians and the consequent deliverance of the Apostle, are enabled to receive through him the blessings of the true Gospel. There is much difficulty in finding a right translation for πρόσωπον, which does not, in the N.T., exactly mean "person" in the modern sense of the word. Hence some render:—"from many faces," turned heavenward, as we may imagine them, in the giving of thanks.

**12.** The connection is that he has just claimed their intercessory prayer, "for" he has done nothing to forfeit that claim. He had been charged with insincerity for not fulfilling his promise of visiting them, and, as a proof, had been advanced the fact that he had sent first Timothy (1 Cor. iv. 17, 18, 19) and then Titus, without going himself. His answer is that his conscience fully acquits him. Simplicity is the opposite of that duplicity which would allow a man to say one thing while he meant another, or to keep in reserve a purpose at variance with a profession. "Godly sincerity" should be "**sincerity of God**," which means that God is the author of this grace. "Carnal wisdom" is the unprincipled cunning which calculates with subtlety only its own advantage or convenience. "The world" and the wickedness that belongs to it render it incumbent upon the saints to walk guilelessly, and with this obligation the apostle felt that he had complied. In Corinth, a head-quarters of Greek wisdom and sophistry, of trade and its artifices, of partizanship and intrigue, where St. Paul had been assailed by many wiles, there was not indeed any temptation to him to resort to like practices, but a great liability to the suspicion of doing so. On this account he had been more scrupulously circumspect there, and he probably also means that he had used extreme care to avoid even the semblance of evil in his relation towards a Church, which he had esteemed so highly, but in which there were many who would turn any supposed flaw in his conduct to the worst account.

**13, 14.** He re-asserts his sincerity, "for" it is not true that his letters have any other sense than that which presents itself on the simple reading, or any at variance with what they well knew of him personally. The first key to the meaning of a letter is what is written: the next is the personal knowledge which the reader has of the writer. Both guides should have shewn the Corinthians that the imputation was false. What he expects them to know well of him is stated in ver. 14 and is, that there exists between him and them so close and sacred a relation as to preclude the possibility of his deceiving them. One side of this relation is that he, as their spiritual Father, was a pride and boast to them. This, no doubt, alludes to the manifestation, on the part of his readers in their first gratitude for their conversion, of some such feelings towards him as are mentioned in Gal. iv. 14, 15. It is a reminder of a former and happier state of things which he desires to see restored. The other side of the relation is that *they* also are *his* pride and boast This he connects. by anticipation, with the

Digitized by Google

joicing, even as ye also *are* our's in the day of the Lord Jesus.

15 And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before, that ye might have a second [1]benefit;

16 And to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you to be brought on my way toward Judæa.

17 When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea yea, and nay nay?

18 But *as* God *is* true, our [1]word toward you was not yea and nay.

[1] Or, *grace.*

[1] Or, *preaching.*

---

day of the Lord's coming, when he will have to present his readers as members of the pure Church unto Christ, and when the secrets of all hearts will be made known. Looking forward to the glory and the disclosures of that day, it is impossible that he should cloud his prospect by insincerity. As a portion of the Church did actually (καί) come to know him in this relation to them, so he hopes that they will maintain it until the Advent.

**15, 16.** State what he originally wished in regard to visiting them in his confidence that this knowledge subsisted in full force. See Introduction, pp. 379, 380. He shewed the Corinthians two preferences. 1. He purposed to pay them two visits on the same journey, while the Macedonians were only to have one. 2. He preferred an escort from *them*, to one from any other Church. He uses an extreme particularity of language. In the compass of a few words we have "before," "second," "again," used to bring out nearly the same idea. The name "Macedonia" and the phrase "come to you" are both repeated. We have in succession "to you," "through you," "to you," "by you." This minuteness almost suggests that enemies had tried to detect an equivocation in the terms of his first statement about this visit, and that he here labours to bring out the natural sense of what he said. The translation of the verse is: "And in this confidence I wished to come to you previously" (before going into Macedonia), "that you might have a second grace" (on my return from Macedonia), "and again from Macedonia to come to you, and by you to be escorted into Judaea."

**17.** The right reading (βουλόμενος) and rendering is: "**While this then is what I was wishing, did I, as is inferred, resort to levity**" (in altering my plan), "**or what I plan, do I plan** according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea, yea, and nay, nay?" There were two uncharitable explanations of his not coming. One that he was a man without steady, earnest purpose, without ballast, who shifted lightly from course to course. The other, that he formed his plans according to a carnal rule, so that at the very ime when he made a positive promise, he might be contemplating a positive refusal to perform it. As such a method could not be dictated by the spirit, it is rightly said to be "according to the flesh," which means here not only that it is weak, as levity is, but unprincipled. Amongst many interpretations of the double 'yea' and double 'nay,' the best is that which takes them respectively as an emphatic affirmation, a decided 'yes,' and an emphatic negation, a decided 'no.' Cf. Matt. v. 7. In the case before us "yea, yea" is a positive 'yes, I will come,' and "nay, nay," a positive 'no, I will not come.' This implies, as stated in the Introduction, that he had *actually* said something which looked like a positive refusal to come. His Judaizing adversaries asserted in order to ruin his character that he intended from the beginning to substitute for his promise this refusal to fulfil it, whenever it suited his purpose, and this assertion, it appears, had its effect upon the Jewish Christians. For another interpretation of "yea, yea" and "nay, nay," see the note at end of chapter.

**18.** It is rather doubtful whether language allows the first words to be taken as an adjuration, as in the A.V. Many, therefore, regard them as an asseveration. "But God is **faithful**, in that our word to you **did not prove** yea and nay." God's faithfulness to his promises is substantiated in our not having preached a Gospel which was a compound of affirmation and negation. In any case, he draws an argument from the straightforwardness and good faith of his preaching to that of his letters and conduct. So far as a man's preaching is really an index to his character, the general reasoning is, no doubt, sound, but it would be farfetched if it had not a special application. The point in debate is the fulfilment of promises. The Gospel is the fulfilment of *all* God's promises of salvation. It was faithfully set forth as such, in St. Paul's preaching, without reservation, equivocation, or negation. He would have it inferred that he deals with his own promises in action, as he does with God's in preaching, in perfect good faith, not playing fast and loose, and this involves a sharp reflection upon the Judaizers. They were the

Digitized by Google

19 For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, *even* by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea.

20 For all the promises of God in him *are* yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us.

21 Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, *is* God;

22 Who hath also sealed us, and

---

persons who accused him of bad faith, while they themselves did not preach in good faith the unreserved fulfilment of God's promises. Their preaching placed God in the predicament in which their accusation tried to place St. Paul. God had promised salvation by faith to all men, both Jews and Gentiles, while they restricted this promise to a legal and Jewish salvation. They made God 'yea' to the Jews and 'nay' to the Gentiles, whereas He was 'yea' to both. See Klöpper. The sum of the argument is: 1. One whose preaching honestly sets forth the complete fulfilment of God's promises will not practise double-dealing with his own. 2. Those who make God a double-dealer are not to be believed when they make St. Paul one, but are double-dealers themselves.

**19.** This and the following verse further explain the argument. Jesus Christ, the concrete sum and substance of St. Paul's preaching, was also the concrete fulfilment of all God's promises, not a compound of contradictions; not affirmation to the Jews and negation to the Gentiles. That this Christ is described as the Christ preached by Paul, Timothy, and Silvanus, shews that the Apostle had in his mind another Christ preached in Corinth, who *was* a compound of 'yea' and 'nay.' This was the Christ of the Judaizers. St. Paul's Christ is designated by the great title "Son of God." The other was not the son of the one faithful God, Father of Gentiles as well as Jews, but at the most a son of David according to the flesh, who disappointed the vast majority of those to whom the promises were made. In St. Paul's Christ an unqualified 'yea **has**,' as he says, '**been brought about**.'

**20.** For as many promises of God (as there are), in Him 'is **their** yea.' The next sentence has to be read and rendered thus:—"and **through him** (ensued) **your** amen, **for glory to God through us**." In St. Paul's Christ *all* God's promises—not those given to Jews only—had their absolute fulfilment. Further, "through Christ," because he was such a fulfilment, there followed on the part of the Corinthians an acceptance of Him as such, expressed in their "amen," which signified their assent to the Apostle's preaching. This reminds the readers that they had confessed the true Christ, and therefore hints that they must not fall away to a different Christ. Glory redounded to God through St. Paul and his colleagues, because they preached, and their hearers accepted thankfully, a Christ who left none of God's promises unredeemed, but made Him a true God, who keepeth covenant.

**21, 22.** Self-defence continued. He is ever receiving from God a firmer establishment **into** Christ. As God is the author of this continually-strengthened bond, and as Christ is a uniform self-consistent 'yea,' the Apostle, being animated with the spirit of Him into whom he is established, cannot drift through vacillation or shift through bad faith from 'yea' to 'nay.' Moreover, this establishment is a *consolidation with his readers* into Christ. How could he be indifferent or untrue to those who were participators with himself in this holy union? There may possibly be a hint intended that they should not let *their* firm hold of the true Christ be relaxed. Further, he received (χρίσας, aor.) from the same God, in his Apostolic appointment, an anointing, a sealing, and an inward earnest of the Spirit, which are so many pledges of a loyal discharge of his ministry. The three figures represent three aspects of the operation of the Spirit upon him and in him. Anointing was the theocratic rite by which Kings, Priests, and Prophets were consecrated to their high offices, and it symbolised their reception of the Spirit of God, which alone could qualify them for the right performance of their functions. St. Paul was thus consecrated and endowed immediately after his conversion; for Ananias said to him, "The Lord . . . hath sent me, that thou mightest . . . be filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts ix. 17). There is an agreement in sound and sense, in the original, between the title 'Christ' and the word for anointed which it is not easy to reproduce in English. "He who stablisheth us with you into Christ and gave us a chrism is God." It intimates that the very same Spirit is in St. Paul which is in Christ. The pseudo-apostles at Corinth imagined that the qualifications for Apostleship were such things as having been the disciples of Christ in the flesh, or having been taught by disciples of Christ, or having received letters of recommendation from such persons. Accord-

Digitized by Google

given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

23 Moreover I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet unto Corinth.

24 Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by faith ye stand.

---

ing to St. Paul, the true qualification was an unction of the Spirit, such as Christ received at His baptism and the Apostle himself at his conversion and baptism (Acts ix. 18.) A seal is a mark of validity and genuineness, or of property, or of destination. He may have had all these ideas in his mind here. The seal, as a mark of genuineness, might then denote, according to its nature and use, the more visible and outward marks that he was a true ambassador of God and Apostle of Christ, such as his miraculous powers, the Churches which were his spiritual creations, and the like. The ideas of property and destination would apply thus. God "sealed" him "for Himself" (mid. voice) in a special manner at his conversion, as "a chosen vessel unto Him, to bear His name among the Gentiles" (Acts ix. 15). Both in Eph. i. 13 and iv. 30, however, the sealing "by the Holy Spirit of promise" signifies the destination for redemption in the day of the Lord. If this be meant here, the sense runs into that of the next words, which represent the Spirit as the earnest or pledge in the Apostle's heart of the future inheritance (Eph. i. 14), and the difference is that the seal is more external and the earnest internal. All believers have this earnest, and, in a modified sense, an anointing and a sealing also. The Apostle, however, is not speaking of these things as shared by him with his readers, but as so many spiritual guarantees of his true Apostleship and pledges of his ministerial fidelity towards them.

**23.** Explains the delay of his visit, which had been the ground of the imputations against him. The solemn adjuration shows the importance which he attached to clearing himself. The emphatic pronoun '*I*' brings the Apostle prominently forward in his own person, apparently in relation to God, who had done so much to qualify him for the due performance of his work. "**But** I invoke God upon my soul as a **witness**, that **wishing to spare you** I came no more to Corinth." If the soul may be regarded as the seat of the motives, the sense may be that he calls God, as it were, to overlook and inspect his soul, as a witness that the true ground for his not coming to Corinth is that which he states. If the soul be regarded as that which God has power to save or destroy, the meaning is that he is prepared to endure the visitation of the divine wrath upon his soul for the guilt of abusing God's great ministerial gifts, and for perjuring himself in the Divine name, if his allegation upon oath be not true, that he deferred his visit from the desire to spare them a deserved chastisement.

**24.** This motive, however, must be guarded from misconstruction. He who claims the power of sparing and punishing seems to assume a lordship over the subjects of his discipline, and he had, no doubt, been charged with this pretension, both in the case of the immoral person whom he had condemned and in other matters. In no instance was such an imputation more baseless than in his. He taught that, as soon as a man has attained to faith, he comes to full age and liberty. Until that time he is under bondage, but through faith he receives the spirit of adoption, and can call God his Father. See Gal. iii. 25; iv. 6; v. 1. Consistently with this, he asserts that he is not exercising lordship over their faith, but, on the contrary, an opposite function, viz., that of a fellow-worker of their joy.

Joy for reception of the unmerited blessings of the Gospel is one of the firstfruits of the Spirit, following upon faith, and is the gift of God. It is capable of diminution or increase, according as men stand erect and firm, or vacillate and stumble in faith. Now in respect of their faith, his readers were standing fast, and so needed no one to exercise mastery over them. It only remained for the Apostle to co-operate with God in promoting their Christian joy by counselling, encouraging, comforting, and similar functions of his ministry. It may seem remarkable that he ascribes so unhesitatingly a steady faith to his readers; but here, as elsewhere in the Epistle, when he addresses the better disposed amongst them, with whom he trusts to effect a complete reconciliation, he speaks in that spirit of love which believeth and hopeth all things. He is speaking to different persons in ch. xiii. 5, to men whose far-going heathenism or Judaism had cast doubts upon the reality of their faith. With the contents of this verse the difficult passage in Gal. iv. 31, v. 1 should be compared. The translation "by faith ye stand" is usually supposed to signify that faith

Digitized by Google

furnishes the sure base of salvation in general, which is not the sense that the context requires. The Apostle by no means asserts that he has no authority over them in any circumstances. If they should lapse from the faith, they would again fall under tutelage and need a schoolmaster to bring them again to Christ.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. I.

Ver 3.—The Affliction in Asia.

There are many opinions as to what this affliction was. The uproar of Demetrius at Ephesus, a dangerous disease, a shipwreck (2 Cor. xi. 25), some machinations of the "many adversaries" (1 Cor. xvi. 9), a plot of the Jews which imperilled his life somewhere between Ephesus and Troas, have all been suggested. The circumstances and St. Paul's language seem to shew that it was his trouble about the condition and the conduct of the Church of Corinth.

1. It came upon him in Asia, and it was known to his readers. How his affliction accords with these particulars we have already seen.

2. It must have had *special reference* to the Corinthians. Otherwise it could not have stood prominently in the head and front of an Epistle bearing so closely upon their peculiar circumstances and all that is said about its conducing to their comfort and salvation would be vague and strained, instead of appropriate and natural.

3. A comparison of the terms used about this affliction in ch. i. 3—11 with those employed in other parts of the Epistle to describe his feelings about Corinthian affairs strongly favours this identification. In ch. ii. 4, the grief in which he had written is called "much affliction and anguish of heart." Compare ch. ii. 12. In Macedonia again, when "his flesh had no rest" on account of his anxiety for news from Corinth, he says that he was "afflicted" (ch. vii. 5). This could scarcely have been a different affliction from that of chap. ii. The term "comfort" points still more decidedly in the same direction. It is very difficult to think that ch. i. 3, 4 and ch. vii. 4, 6 refer to different occasions of comfort. We have, as has been already noted in ch. i. 3-7, one form or other of the word for 'comfort' ten times in five verses, and, in ch. vii. 6, 7, 13, six times in three verses. In other words there is exactly the same harping upon comfort in connection with his deliverance from the affliction in Asia, that occurs with reference to his release from devouring anxiety about Corinth.

It is also very doubtful whether a man like St. Paul would have used such language as that of ch. i. 8, about danger or suffering which threatened his body or his life merely. It must have been something which afflicted his spirit as well.

Ver. 7. Many regard the second 'yea' and 'nay' as predicates of the first 'yea' and 'nay' respectively. According to this view, the rendering is, "that with me my yea should be yea and my nay nay;" and the drift, 'Do I form my plans after a carnal rule, and make it my sole object, when I have once said that I will do or not do a thing, to let nothing whatever divert me from carrying out my stated purpose, through mere pertinacity or in order to maintain a false consistency?' He thus asserts his right to retract or modify any plan of proceeding which he may have announced, if he should find it good or desirable to do so. As a matter of language, no doubt, the second 'yea' and 'nay' may be taken as predicates, as in Jas. v. 12, ἤτω ὑμῶν τὸ ναί, ναί, καὶ τὸ ὄυ, ὄυ. But there are strong reasons against the interpretation.

1. In ver. 18 we find the single 'yea' and 'nay' substituted for the double. and καί uniting them, so as to represent a compound of affirmation and negation, even according to the advocates of the above view; and it would be strange if καί did not serve the same purpose with regard to the double as it does with regard to the single 'yea' and 'nay' in two consecutive verses, the double 'yea' and 'nay' being only a stronger form than the single, as in Matt. v. 37.

2. He was not accused of obstinacy or the dogged desire of consistency, but of weakness and of carnal cunning, and the line of defence which this interpretation attributes to him against these accusations would have been a very questionable one. The remark that he was bound to admit, in the present case, that he had substituted a 'nay' for a 'yea' is scarcely quite correct; for he had never said absolutely that he would not come, but only, that he would *not* come *unless* the Corinthians reformed their conduct (2 Cor. ii. 3). That he was always "ready to come" is proved not only by his assertions, but by the fact that he was on his way to them at the very time of his writing. The impression conveyed by vv. 18, 19, 20, 21 decidedly is that he asserts himself to be a man of his word, and not that he claims a right of replacing a 'yea' by a 'nay' when ever he thinks it desirable

Digitized by Google

3. Nearly all the supporters of this interpretation, in order to make the defence implied in it less doubtful, think the meaning is that it depends upon *God's* permission whether the Apostle carries out a 'yea' or a 'nay' that he has once uttered. Hofmann brings out this sense prominently by rendering "that 'yea' should be 'yea,' and 'nay' nay, according to *my* judgment," not according to God's. But that there is no such reference as this is clear from ver. 23, where he says that it was his merciful consideration for his readers that prevented his visit, and from ch. ii. 1, where he says *he decided* out of consideration for himself not to come. Nothing could have been easier than for him to say that God hindered him, had he meant this. Nevertheless Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, and Bengel all hold this interpretation.

---

## CHAPTER II.

1 *Having shewed the reason why he came not to them,* 6 *he requireth them to forgive and to comfort that excommunicated person,* 10 *even as himself also upon his true repentance had forgiven him,* 12 *declaring withal why he departed from Troas to Macedonia,* 14 *and the happy success which God gave to his preaching in all places.*

BUT I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness.

2 For if I make you sorry, who is he then that maketh me glad, but the same which is made sorry by me?

3 And I wrote this same unto

---

CHAP. II. 1. Merciful consideration for his readers (i. 23) was not his only reason for staying away. "But I determined, **for my own sake**, this, not again in grief to come to you." The rendering, according to the Received Text, would be: "not again to come in grief to you," but it has little or no authority, and probably arose out of the assumption that St. Paul had been only once in Corinth. But even *it* is not inconsistent with a previous visit of grief. It is arbitrary to say, on account of i. 23, that 'in grief' means 'bringing grief with him to inflict it upon them.' Nor is this sense supported by 1 Cor. iv. 21, where the phrase of the A. V. "with a rod" is literally "in a rod." The true parallelism of that passage to this lies in the words which follow "in a rod," viz. "in love and the spirit of meekness." As the love there meant is a love felt in the Apostle's own heart, so is the grief here. The language indicates that he is introducing a different idea from that in i. 23, nor is the beginning of the next verse against this.

2. States the reason why it was for his own sake that he took his decision. It was, that to come in grief to them would be to seal up the source of his own joy. "For if I grieve you, then who is it that gladdens me save he that is grieved by me?" It would grieve him to inflict a punishment which would grieve them. Between him and them there was a mutual relation of joy-giving (i. 24) which a mutual grief-giving would destroy.

N.B. Although there may be no actual instance of *καί* introducing the second clause of a compound conditional sentence, when that clause is a direct interrogative, its occurrence here should not have created so much difficulty, because there is no reason in language why it should not be so used. It denotes the close and immediate juxtaposition in the Apostle's mind of the question with the antecedent condition, and may properly be rendered 'then' or 'in that case.' It is merely the apodotic *καί* and that the apodosis is a question is accidental.

The singular number has led some to think that in "he that is grieved" there is an allusion to the great offender, which would require a totally different turn to be given to the verse. 'I would not come to you in grief and grieve you in person, but I did so by letter: for if I grieve you by letter (ver. 3), there is this advantage, that he who is grieved in that way is the same who gives me joy by repenting.' Some adopt this interpretation without supposing any reference to the offender, but it lacks simplicity. The singular sums up as one person all those whom he would have pained by coming, and describes them as a single object of his personal love (cf. xi. 4).

3. States what he did in accordance with his decision, and because his readers were the proper source of his joy. "I wrote **this very thing**." Inasmuch as the "this" here clearly takes up the "this" of ver. 1, "this very thing" can be nothing else than his decision not to come to visit them, so long as it would be necessary for him to come in grief. Here then we have disclosed the foundation of the charge that he had written a "nay" contradictory to his former "yea," and the reason why he had done so. He did not

Digitized by Google

you, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice; having confidence in you all, that my joy is *the joy* of you all.

4 For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you.

5 But if any have caused grief, he hath not grieved me, but in part: that I may not overcharge you all.

6 Sufficient to such a man *is* this [1]punishment, which *was inflicted* of many.

[1] Or, *censure*.

---

write this in any extant letter. In the First Epistle he still declared categorically that he would come. It can only be inferred that he wrote it in a letter subsequent to the First Epistle, and that must have been the letter carried by Titus. His object was that he might, by adjourning his visit until he could make it without grief, remove what would grieve him when he did come, at the hands of those who ought to be fellow-workers of his joy, as he was of theirs. He wrote with this object in the confidence that there was an identity of joy between him and all of them. This would prompt them to take the steps requisite for preventing his grief, not simply because it was their duty, but with gladness. What the steps were he had stated in his letter, and one of them was the execution of the sentence of excommunication, for opposing which he had, in that letter, not spared them.

**4.** If he had been so anxious not to grieve them, why had he written so severely? His enemies had appealed to his letter as a proof that he was a reckless disturber of the peace and happiness of the community and its individual members. He explains. The anguish out of which he wrote shews that this was a calumny. So does his object in writing, for his purpose was not that they should be grieved, but that they might know the overflow of his affection for them. Had he loved them less, he would not have felt so insuperable a repugnance to giving pain in person, nor so profound an anxiety to remedy the prevailing evils by a letter. It was from the sense of his love which he endeavoured to awaken in them by writing, that he expected to rouse them to take with energy the desired measures.

**5.** The main topic of his letter, and cause of his grief, had been the case of the sinful person often mentioned (1 Cor. v. 1, ff.). Against this man he had been accused of proceeding with personal exasperation, as if the offence had been committed against him individually He disclaims this, by declaring that not he individually, but all the Church, had been aggrieved by the offender. Yet in order not to press heavily upon the guilty but now penitent man, by representing too strongly the heinousness of his conduct, he will not say that absolutely all the Corinthians had been grieved, but only "partly" all of them. He alludes to a section in the Church which had either all along, or in the progress of the discussion about the case, taken more lenient views and deemed it one in which pardon might be granted or some mercy shewn. The fact that there had been a portion of the community which held this view, St. Paul uses with great tact, in order to mitigate the contrite man's sense of guilt. He could not have applied for this purpose the views of the thoroughly antinomian party, nor the feelings of persons whose conduct was almost as bad as that of the chief transgressor himself. It is plain that there was another more respectable class which advocated milder treatment. The Apostle does not, of course, assert that the case in question had given him no pain, but only denies that he regarded it as involving a *personal* offence against him, such as could awaken a *personal* animosity, and it is on that account that he puts the personal pronoun first. For ἐπιβαρεῖν, which means 'to be a burden to,' 'to weigh heavily upon,' see 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8. In the verse before us it has no expressed object, and perhaps ought to be rendered simply "in order that I may not oppress." But the tacit reference must be to the guilty man. See note at end of chapter.

**6.** Since the last letter an assembly of the Church had been held to discuss the case, and the debate had been closed by a division in which the majority had voted for punishment of the offender. It is plain that the sentence passed had been referred to the Apostle for his approval or disapproval, and the absence of any connecting particle indicates that he is now delivering his judgment upon it. What the punishment was is not stated, but it fell short of what St. Paul had prescribed, for the reasons which he assigns for pronouncing it sufficient are that it was inflicted upon such a one as the guilty man had by his contrition proved himself to be, and that it was all that the majority had thought it right to impose. Some think that no decree had been actually passed, but that the majority had practically treated the

Digitized by Google

7 So that contrariwise ye *ought* rather to forgive *him*, and comfort *him*, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.

8 Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm *your* love toward him.

9 For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all things.

10 To whom ye forgive any thing, I *forgive* also: for if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave *it*, for your sakes *forgave I it* [1]in the person of Christ;

[1] Or, *in the sight*

---

offender as an excommunicated person. But as the word "**ratify**" (*confirm* A.V.) in ver. 8 points to a formal decision, by which he was to be restored, he must have been under some regular sentence. Whether it was excommunication for a limited time, or excommunication without delivery over to Satan, there is nothing to shew.

**7-8.** It appears that, with the appeal to the Apostle upon the reduced sentence, there had been submitted also a memorial, brought by Titus, or a suggestion from some members of the Church, that the punishment should be increased to the severity which had been originally prescribed. Only on this supposition can the term "contrariwise" be explained, and it is a very natural supposition, for one of the feelings which they had manifested so strongly in the presence of Titus was their 'exacting of punishment' (2 Cor. vii. 11). However, from the results obtained, and the nature of the case, the Apostle is in a position to recommend the opposite course, that a pardon should be granted, comfort administered, and that the Church should pass a decree for the restitution of that brotherly love which had been for a while withdrawn from the unhappy man. The first part of this verse should be taken in close connection with the preceding, for it contains no idea of obligation, such as the "ought" of the A. V. implies. The literal translation simply is "so as for you to pardon," and the drift is that, in such an instance, the punishment already imposed is enough 'for them, on the contrary, rather to pardon' than to increase the penalty. His object in counselling a plenary pardon was to save the condemned from being "swallowed up" by remorse. He seems to have been in danger of spiritual ruin from despair, or of dying of a broken heart, or perishing by self-destruction.

**9.** The adoption of his advice will be in accordance with the object of his writing. He had intended to put them upon their probation, and "ascertain their **approvedness** whether they were obedient on all points." This was partly his aim with regard to the sentence of excommunication delivered in the First Epistle to be executed *by them in his absence*. They did *not* answer to *that* probation, but when Timothy was at Corinth the Church seemed to have cast off its allegiance. As the immorality, of which it is always to be remembered that the one grosser case was only an example, was in flagrant contradiction to the principle of holiness essential to a Christian community, so the disregard of apostolic authority was inconsistent with the status of a true church. It was, no doubt, forcibly pointed out through Titus and his letter that the only course open to the Corinthians was immediate and complete submission. In order to test them upon this point it was a more effectual method to write than to go in person, because it left them more to the exercise of their own free will. They *did* answer to *this* testing by enforcing the necessary discipline. Having done so on one side, the Apostle now suggests that they should answer to it on another and more gracious side, by granting a pardon, and so they will shew themselves approved and obedient "on all points." It may be observed that, while he renounces lordship over their faith, he yet requires compliance with all apostolic directions.

**10.** "*But*" having ascertained their approvedness through their punishing the guilty, he can now say that *their* pardon, if they choose to act upon his present exhortation, draws *his* along with it. The right rendering and reading is:—"**But** (him) whom ye forgive anything so do I; for **what I have forgiven** (ὃ κεχάρ.), if **I have forgiven** anything, for your sakes (I have forgiven it) **before the face** of Christ." It is not the forgiveness of *sin* that is in question, but of the offence done to the Church and its founder through the stain that had been brought upon them (ver. 5). The language implies that the prevalent disposition at Corinth was to forgive this offence, and probably the force of the present tense is 'him, whom ye are inclined to forgive.' With this disposition the Apostle fell in, as was clear from his advice just given, and the perfect tenses now express that he had already forgiven, if indeed forgiveness was the right term to apply to him, for he still adheres to what he said in ver. 5. He had done so, not merely in compliance with them, and because their conduct had



Digitized by Google

11 Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.

12 Furthermore, when I came to Troas to *preach* Christ's gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord,

13 I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into Macedonia.

14 Now thanks *be* unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the

---

shewed their approvedness, but "for their sakes," and in the full consciousness that Christ was cognizant and approved of what he did and of the object which he had in view.

**11.** This object he states in order to shew how he had acted "for their sakes." It was to prevent the Corinthians and himself from being over-reached, and having advantage taken of them by Satan, whose devices or thoughts he did not fail to see. These devices were the malignant designs of Satan's ministers in Corinth (xi. 15), with regard to the case in question. These were the extreme Judaizers, and they were playing the devil's part in the matter. Had they been honest, they must have declared themselves in favour of the penalty prescribed by the Mosaic law, which was death. But they held themselves in reserve in order to allow the Apostle to ruin his own cause. They pointed, no doubt, to the flagrant sin as the natural and inevitable fruit of St. Paul's preaching, which, by setting aside the law, opened the door, as they said, to all heathen abominations. They would find not a few Jewish believers ready to listen to them, and those whom they influenced may have been some of the party who advocated the severer punishment. See ver. 7. But the Apostle discerned that the end in view was to create an irreparable breach between him and the community, and to gain full possession of the field for themselves. He would save himself and his readers from this satanic machination.

The delicacy and reticence with which this very tender subject is treated in these verses deserves remark. There is no name, no specification of particulars, not a word more than is absolutely needed to make his meaning clear, not a vestige of anything calculated to reawaken irritation or give pain. Having asserted the great principle of pure morality in the Church and, in a great measure, succeeded, he is able, in the most loving and gracious manner, to pour oil into a smarting wound. The burning question is now on the way to a happy settlement.

**12.** "**But**" it had, with all its attendant circumstances, given him excessive pain. Such seems the simple connection which is greatly obscured by the "*furthermore*" of the A.V. Nothing can be more natural than that he should, after seeing his way to the end of a distressing matter, recur to the great affliction which it had caused him, and out of which the desired issue had sprung, in order that he may do full justice to the unspeakable relief which the news of Titus had brought him. The change which Titus reported he regards as a triumph and paints it in brilliant colours (vv. 14, 15, 16), as a contrast to the dark picture of his previous tribulation. The extent of his distress shews how different his feelings towards the Corinthians were from what his enemies represented them. He pourtrays it in strong touches. He went to Troas to preach, which was the great object of his life, but though "a door **stood open**" (perf. part.) to him "**in the Lord**" leading to labours which promised success, he could not fully avail himself of it. His spirit, that part of his nature which was least liable to perturbation, most active in his gospel-work, the centre of his religious life, lacked the requisite calm, because he did not find Titus with tidings from Corinth. The unrest is so vividly engraven on his mind, that he seems to throw himself back into the situation, for he says:—"I **have not got relief** to my spirit." The original is a perfect tense of an aorist form. It almost suggests the idea that he may be reproducing the very words in which he assigned to the people of Troas his reason for leaving them, 'I must go. I have got no relief for my spirit.' "Them" refers to the inhabitants of Troas implied in the name of their town in ver. 12.

**14.** No sooner has he mentioned Macedonia than he raises a hymn of thanksgiving for the blessing there received. The success achieved through Titus and announced to him in Macedonia, he regards as a turning of the tide which will lead to the victory of himself and the truth in Corinth, and to the overthrow of his enemies. He represents himself as continually waging war with Satan and his agents, and exhibited at all times, together with his fellow-labourers, as God's triumphal pageant, in which, as it proceeds through the Gentile world, God, by means of the Apostle's preaching, visibly spreads, in every place, the odour of the knowledge of Himself, like the smoke of the incense in the midst of which the conqueror's train defiled. (See note at the end of the chapter.) In the

Digitized by Google

savour of his knowledge by us in every place.

15 For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish:

16 To the one *we are* the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who *is* sufficient for these things?

17 For we are not as many, which [1]corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

[1] Or, *deal deceitfully with.*

---

expression "maketh manifest the odour of the knowledge," the Apostle probably had in his mind the visible smoke of burning incense. At any rate odours which proceed from burning materials, aptly symbolise by their penetrativeness and diffusiveness the knowledge of God spread by apostolic preaching. Possibly, however, the "manifesting" may refer to the knowledge signified by the odour rather than the odour itself, just as the cognate figure of shining and lightening is applied to the knowledge of God in iv. 6. "In Christ" denotes the incense breathing atmosphere in which the triumphal procession moves. It arises from the union between the Apostle and Christ, which is such that all his warfare is waged and all his victories won only by the spirit and life and power of Christ within him. This and the figure of the odour are further explained in the next verse.

**15.** The reason why God leads him in triumph is that he is a sweet odour of Christ unto God. In the last verse he was the medium through which the odour of the knowledge of God was manifestly diffused; now he is the odour of Christ. The primary medium through which God diffuses the knowledge of himself is Christ, the secondary channel is the Apostle. The primary and the secondary are blended into one, not improperly, for Christ lived in the Apostle (Gal. ii. 20), and breathed through him in His ministerial work the perfume of His divine spirit and essence, which was acceptable to God. It is doubtful whether there is any allusion to the "odour of sweet smell" ascribed to thank-offerings in the O.T. and applied in Phil. iv. 18; Eph. v. 2. But it is probable there is not, because there is no allusion to sacrifice in the passage, nor has the Apostle used the established phrase (ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας), for "odour of sweet smell." There are two parties of men amongst whom this odour circulates, those that are on their way to salvation and those that are on their way to perdition, just as in a triumphal procession there are the conqueror, his friends, and his troops, and on the other hand the conquered chiefs and meaner captives, both of which parties breathe the perfume of the incense.

**16.** To the former of these the fragrance was a symbol of present deliverance and future safety; to the latter it was a token of present defeat and condemnation, and a premonitor of approaching death. "Just as the pomp was ascending the Capitoline hill some of the hostile chiefs were led aside into the adjoining prison and put to death" (Smith's 'Dict. of Antt.' on "Triumphus"). So it was in the Apostle's triumph. To some the odour signified life leading to further life; to others, death leading to further death. The sweet odour of Christ, essentially one and the same, has according to the opposite spiritual conditions of those whom it approaches an opposite significance or, to blend the odour with what it represents, an opposite property and operation. To those who, when they breathed it, welcomed it and so are in a state of salvation, it is a power of life ever advancing from the first germs of life (ἐκ ζωῆς) which it engendered, when welcomed, until it culminates in absolute life eternal. To those who, when they breathed it, repudiated it, and so are in a state of perdition, it is a power of death, ever advancing from the first condemnation and seeds of death (ἐκ θανάτου) which it caused to work in them, when repudiated, until it culminates in absolute death eternal. That such operations and such results should ever take effect through his own or any other human agency seems for a moment to fill him with amazement, under the influence of which he exclaims: "for these things who is sufficient?" The answer is not given, but is implied in the next verse. It is the irresistible power of the word of God preached without human adulteration and out of pure sincerity.

N.B. Whatever difficulties may be thought to attach to the readings 'from death unto death' and 'from life unto life,' external evidence is overwelming in their favour.

**17.** This is the way in which he and his fellow-labourers preached it, in contrast with "the many," who, like dishonest tavern-keepers selling adulterated wine for gain, delivered a gospel corrupted with human and Jewish ingredients, for their own selfish ends. *They*, on the contrary, spoke as men whose words flow out of genuine sincerity, as men who derive the substance of their preaching and their commission to preach from God, as men conscious that they are speaking in God's presence, to whom they will have



Digitized by Google

to render their account. The atmosphere in which the Apostle spoke was Christ, which is the cause of their success; while that in which their Judaizing adversaries spoke was Satan (xi. 15). The unsophisticated word of God thus proclaimed puts forth all its living powers, divides mankind into two opposite hosts, and delivers them over to two opposite destinies. "The many" cannot denote, as the original often, but by no means always, does, 'the majority.' That sense, as has been well observed, would cast an unmerited shadow npon the Apostolic Church. Neither does it necessarily mean that the false teachers in Corinth were absolutely numerous, although they did no doubt outnumber the true preachers and sorely beset the simpler minded. But the phrase conveys an idea of contempt, intimating that such persons belonged to the common herd of mankind, and acted for ignoble ends, like cheating traders.

This whole passage (14–17) refers so clearly to the happy issue of Titus's mission, and all its points bear so distinctly upon the antagonism of the Corinthian Judaizers as indicated to us in other parts of the Epistle, that the question whether it alludes to some deliverance and successes in Macedonia need not be discussed.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. II.

Ver. 5. The interpretation of this verse depends upon the connection of ἀπὸ μέρους, and upon the object of ἐπιβαρῶ. Upon both points there are various views.

1. Ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μέρους is taken closely with οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν, and πάντας ὑμᾶς is made the object of ἐπιβαρῶ. "It is not me that he has grieved, save in part: in order that I may not overcharge you all." This is the view of Luther, of the A.V., of Bengel, and others. Had the grief fallen entirely and exclusively upon him, they would all have been guilty of indifference to a heinous sin. To avoid bringing so heavy a charge upon them, he says that he has not been grieved except in part. It had not been a "grief due to a single heart," but, as it "concerned the general cause," his readers had shared it. But the ἐμέ standing first, and the ὑμᾶς last, shows that the ἀλλά is the connecting link between the two, and therefore that they have the same grammatical dependence upon λελύπηκε. Moreover ἀλλά is a strongly adversative particle, whereas the above rendering expresses no opposition at all. If the Apostle's meaning had been what it attributes to him, he might at once have made it clear by writing ἀλλ' ἤ or εἰ μή instead of ἀλλά, which is scarcely good Greek in the sense given to it in this interpretation.

2. Ἀπὸ μέρους is taken with ὑμᾶς, and πάντας made the object of ἐπιβαρῶ. "But partly, that I may not overcharge all, you." Billroth explains the drift thus: 'Whether grief has been caused to me is not the question; I was not the person who had to suffer (pay) for him, but you, at least a part of you, for I will not be unjust and impute the guilt to you all of having been indifferent to his offence.' It is clear that Billroth has confounded the grief for the pain and disgrace of punishment with heartfelt sorrow at the sin. The fatal objection to the view, which requires a comma between πάντας and ὑμᾶς, is that if St. Paul had intended this to be his meaning, he could have avoided all obscurity by saying ἵνα μὴ πάντας ἐπιβαρῶ, ὑμᾶς. Olshausen, who adopts Billroth's punctuation, says that ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας is a touch of irony, which, however, would be quite out of place in such a passage.

3. To render ἀπὸ μέρους 'partially,' 'in a measure,' non admodum, non valde, and make it qualify a λελύπηκε to be supplied before πάντας ὑμᾶς. Fritzsche contends that this is the invariable sense of ἀπὸ μέρους, which Billroth rightly declines to admit. The statement would not be true, because the Apostle knew perfectly that there were many at Corinth who had not been grieved at all, and to say that they had all been grieved 'in a measure' in the sense of 'not greatly,' would really have been a reproach to them quite out of harmony with the fine delicacy of the whole passage.

4. To supply ὑμᾶς after ἐπιβαρῶ: 'but partly, that I may not overcharge (you), all of you.' But the context shews plainly that the person upon whom the Apostle does not wish to press heavily is the guilty man. He abstains from mentioning him as the object of ἐπιβαρῶ from his desire to spare him.

Hofmann's interpretation is characteristic and as daring as his arguments are intricate. Meyer has briefly pointed out one or two insuperable objections to it.

Ver. 14. The interpretation depends upon the difficult word θριαμβεύειν. The verbs in -εύω require a more complete investigation than they have yet received or can receive here. Two familiar words will furnish an illustration of the use of θριαμβεύειν in this passage. Μαθητεύειν is 'to be a disciple' or 'to make a disciple.' We may imagine some such connecting link as 'to disciple,' which is pliant either to a neuter or a transitive sense. Βασιλεύειν is 'to be a king,' but also 'to make a king,' as in Isaiah vi. 7, Βασιλεύσομεν

Digitized by Google

τὸν υἱὸν Ταβιήλ, and in many other places. We may conceive some such middle term as 'to king.' 'To feast' is 'to fare sumptuously,' but 'to feast a man' is 'to make him fare sumptuously.' Θρίαμβος and Διθύραμβος, whatever their etymology, were names of the Greek god Dionysus or Bacchus, and also denoted a processional hymn sung in the great Dionysiac festivals. Θρίαμβος came to mean a Dionysiac festive *procession*, and was adopted by the Romans in the form triumphus in the 2nd century B.C. From θρίαμβος was formed the verb θριαμβεύειν, which occurs in Polyb. vi. 53, 7, and from 'triumphus' the verb 'triumphare.' Θριαμβεύειν then, used intransitively in the Roman sense, meant 'to hold or lead a triumphal procession,' which is exactly the meaning of the equivalent for it used in Polybius θρίαμβον ἄγειν. Θριαμβεύειν τοὺς πολίτας would mean in an active sense, in strict analogy with μαθητεύειν and βασιλεύειν, 'To make the citizens a θρίαμβος, a triumphal procession' or 'to lead them in triumphal procession.' Hence the expression ascribed to Cleopatra with reference to the wish of Augustus to lead her in a triumph at Rome, οὐ θριαμβευθήσομαι is quite correctly interpreted by Horace (Ode I. xxxvii. 30):

> "Invidens
> Privata *deduci* superbo
> Non humilis mulier *triumpho*."

A glance through Suicer's article on the word shews how constantly the Greek fathers and others attached the idea of 'display' to it, rather than that of 'triumphing over,' although there certainly seems to be an underlying notion of a public exposure involving more or less of discredit or disgrace. Theodoret's explanation of the passage before us is τῇδε κἀκεῖσε περιάγει δήλους ἡμᾶς πᾶσιν ἀποφαίνων, and the view that the apostles were displayed as *sufferers* seems to be common to the Greek Fathers. We find, however, a passage in Tatian, 'Oratio ad Græcos,' ch. xxii. where θριαμβεύειν implies no discredit or disgrace. Παύσασθε λόγους ἀλλοτρίους θριαμβεύοντες καί, ὥσπερ ὁ κολοιός, οὐκ ἰδίοις ἐπικοσμούμενοι πτεροῖς. 'Cease making a grand display of other people's words and thoughts, and, just like the jackdaw (of Æsop), dressing up in feathers not your own.' Upon this passage Gesner says:—'θριαμβεύειν eleganter usurpat pro *jactare* et tanquam *in triumpho ducere*.' These Greeks did not, of course, parade their plagiarised thoughts and language in order to hold them up to shame or disgrace, but they shewed them off as fine things, just as the jackdaw did his borrowed plumes. Similarly πομπεύειν, which is also used of a Roman triumphal procession, occurs in Epictetus, Diss. III. xxiv. 18, for 'making a parade of power.' Μόνον μὴ πόμπευε αὐτήν (i.e. ἀρχήν). The idea of leading persons in public procession in disgrace or shame was no part of the essential sense of θριαμβεύειν, but only circumstantial, flowing from the fact that the vanquished captives constituted a striking feature in the conqueror's train. Indeed, when used of the Dionysiac festivals, it could not have had any such sense, because in them all was mirth and gaiety. In a Roman triumph the victorious officers and troops were as conspicuous a group as any other, and there is no reason in language why the commander-in-chief or imperator should not be said with reference to his legates and soldiers, θριαμβεύειν αὐτούς, 'to lead them in triumphal pageant.' The imperator himself indeed was the eye of the show, and in that sense Horace says (Odes, IV. iii. 3–10), speaking of what a triumph does for the leader of it—

> "*Ostendet* Capitolio."

The meaning, therefore, of the verse under consideration is: "Thanks be to God who at all times makes a triumphal pageant of us," as His victorious officers or soldiers.

It is doubtful whether θριαμβεύειν and θριαμβεύεσθαι, triumphare and triumphari, are ever used merely in the sense of 'to triumph over,' or 'be triumphed over.' At any rate no instance seems to be forthcoming in which 'to lead' or 'be led in triumph,' is not the more suitable rendering. Even Virg. Aen, vi. 8, where the triumph over Corinth is mentioned, is no exception to this remark. The rendering of the Vulgate, 'qui triumphat nos,' may well bear the same meaning. It is probable that it was merely a literal translation of τῷ θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς, and the fluctuating interpretation of Jerome favours that view.

It will be seen that the meaning above assigned to θριαμβεύοντι is not identical with the so-called 'factitive' sense unhesitatingly given to it by many lexicographers, e.g. Passow: triumphiren lassen; Wahl: triumphare facio aliquem; Grimm: facio ut aliquis triumphet; and that it is not touched by Alford's objection, for it does not make the verb to mean '*triumphatores* facere.'

Those who desire to see the exposition of the verse which is founded on the idea that θριαμβεύειν τινα means 'to triumph over' a person as conquered, must consult Meyer, Hofmann, and Alford. To say nothing of particular objections, it is, from whatever point of view regarded, a strained interpretation.

Little aid can be obtained from the use of θριαμβεύσας in Col. ii. 17, until that passage has been more strictly examined. Bishop Lightfoot does not speak very confidently about his own interpretation of it, but the

Digitized by Google

union of θριαμβεύσας with ἐδειγμάτισεν there is one proof more that 'display' was always an idea associated with θριαμβεύειν. A passage of Plutarch (Vit. Cam. 30), adduced in Bishop Lightfoot's note, would shew very clearly that θριαμβεύειν, used intransitively, denotes display *in a good sense*, if the words omitted in his citation were not ὡς εἰκὸς ἦν, which are, indeed, wrongly printed in some copies as a parenthesis, but which really account for the accusative case, and prove that it is not dependent on the preceding ἐθριάμβευσε. The view that θριαμβεύειν would suggest to a Greek mind its original sense of leading in a Dionysiac procession, and that it is to be explained by that figure here and in Col. ii. 17, is not well founded. To persons living at Corinth it could scarcely fail to connect itself with the memorable triumph of Mummius over that city. Nor would the circulation of the odour of incense amongst those *that are perishing* be accounted for, whereas the sense of this is clear, if the reference be to a Roman triumph.

---

## CHAPTER III.

1 *Lest their false teachers should charge him with vainglory, he sheweth the faith and graces of the Corinthians to be a sufficient commendation of his ministry.* 6 *Whereupon entering a comparison between the ministers of the law and of the gospel,* 12 *he proveth that his ministry is so far the more excellent, as the gospel of life and liberty is more glorious than the law of condemnation.*

DO we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some *others*, epistles of commendation to you, or *letters* of commendation from you?

2 Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men:

3 *Forasmuch as ye are* manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.

---

CHAP. III. 1. What St. Paul has just said of his triumphs was sure to elicit from the assailed "many" the taunt that he was recurring to his tactic of self-praise, which they now regarded as the standing characteristic of his letters. He turns the edge of this sarcasm against its authors. According to *their* views and practices, he was bound to bring letters of commendation from others. But he needed no such letters. The "some" who *did* need them were the "many," who, because they corrupted the truth for self-seeking ends, were incapable of achieving any such triumphs to speak for *their* office and ministry as he could point to on behalf of *his*, in the creation of the Church at Corinth. The bearers of these letters of introduction obtained further letters from the Corinthians, recommending them to the believers in other places, and this is partly the reason why this Epistle is addressed, not only to the Corinthians, but to all the saints in the whole of Achaia, that they also might be on their guard against persons so recommended.

2. He needs no letters to his readers, because he is no unknown newcomer, but their spiritual Father, and they are his children. They are themselves his commendatory letter written in his heart, inscribed on his affections. Reading them there he feels that he needs no commendation to them either from his own or any other pen. As a Christian Church at a conspicuous centre of Greek civilization, they are also an external letter of commendation, taken cognizance of and read as such by all men. The wonderful spiritual manifestations, spoken of in the First Epistle, the fruits of his ministry among them, had not escaped the general observation of the world. Thus he needs no commendatory letters *from* them, they themselves being the strongest warranty of his genuine Apostleship that could be given to mankind at large.

3. Explains, with particular reference in the word "**manifested**" to the "known and read of all men," the full sense in which the Corinthians are such a letter as he has described, and the conception is a truly grand one. The author of this letter is Christ. He dictated it. The scribe, Christ's amanuensis, is the Apostle. The vehicle or material in which it stands written (perf.) is not lifeless ink, but the spirit of the living God The material on which it is written is not cold unimpressible stone, but the fleshy, warm, susceptible tablets of the heart. In such an Epistle all mankind may discern that a new and mighty power, the Spirit of God, has entered into men through the Apostle's ministry, is living, working, manifesting itself in them. Nor is the idea out of place that all men might also herein mark the fulfilment of those prophetic promises, which announced the blessings peculiar to the Messiah's kingdom, as in Joel ii. 28, 29; Ezek. xi. 19, 20; xxxvi. 26; Jer. xxxi. 33. From

Digitized by Google

4 And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward:

5 Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency *is* of God;

6 Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit [1]giveth life.

[1]Or, *quickeneth.*

---

these passages, and from Prov. iii. 3; viii. 3, "write them upon the tablets of thy heart," some of the language of this verse seems to be borrowed. It is obvious that his adversaries can write no such letter as he has written in the Corinthian Church. They are exercising a ministry after the old fashion. They are writing enactments of law with ink upon stone, while he writes with the Spirit upon hearts. Instead of paper or parchment which might have been expected in conjunction with ink, he introduces tablets of stone, partly because he is leading up to a contrast between the new dispensation and the old, of which latter the tables of the Decalogue were the monuments, and partly because there is an allusion to the stony heart of Israel in Ez. xxxvi. 26, for which God had promised to substitute a heart of flesh. There is no inconsistency in saying first that the Corinthians are themselves the letter, and then that the letter is written in them, because it is not in the outward man, but in the inner man of the heart that the letter is written, and, in such a case, the heart is the man. The main point is that Spirit, the vehicle of the Apostle's letter, penetrated to the innermost centre of man's being and traced its living characters there, whilst ink, the material used by his adversaries, never went below the hard surface.

N.B. The best-attested reading of the last words of this verse would yield the rendering: "in tablets (which are) hearts of flesh," or "in tablets (which are) hearts, being fleshy (tablets)."

**4.** He is confident that the Church of Corinth is such a standing testimony to his ministry. This confidence is not mere self-assumption, but a firm assurance, reaching through Christ to the presence of God, and therefore valid in the sight of the searcher of hearts.

**5.** But even this, although he viewed himself as a mere instrument, implies a lofty estimate of himself and his work in Corinth. Who made it competent to him to take such an estimate? Forestalling this question, he asserts that this competency did not proceed from himself (ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν) in the sense that he was the original author of it (ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν), but it had its origin from God. The proof that he had it from God is given in the next verse. Both the expressions, "From ourselves," and "as (coming) out of ourselves," of which the latter more precisely defines the former by denoting a more immediate origination with self, go with the word "competent" and not with "**to take account of,**" as is clear from the antithesis—'our competency is from God.' The verse cannot bear the sense often given to it, that we have no ability of ourselves to plan and work out our own salvation, but that such ability comes from God.

**6.** Proof that this competency comes from God. God gave him a further and a greater competency, which involves the less. God made him competent (i. 22) to be a minister of a dispensation, which from its very nature must produce, when it took effect, exactly such a result as he counts the Corinthian Church to be. He cannot therefore be wrong in estimating it as he has done in ver. 2, 3. Here begins a fine polemical passage, which strikes at the root of the difference between the Apostle and the Jews and Judaizers, by contrasting the superiority of the new dispensation and ministry with the inferiority of the old. "**Who also made us competent to be ministers of a new dispensation, not of written enactment but of spirit, for the written enactment putteth to death, but the spirit maketh alive.**" The first point of contrast is expressed in "new." It was this newness that the Judaizers failed to discern, or discerning declined to acknowledge. They thought the new dispensation valid only in conjunction with the old, and used the new cloth to patch up the old garment. They did not understand that "old things were passed away," and replaced by new. The next point is that the old dispensation was one of written enactment, the new was one of spirit. The old was a dispensation of external law, making exactions, but communicating no inward power of obedience The spirit which was received through the new was a life-giving agent. The Judaizers adhered to the literal requirements of the law. For instance, they insisted upon circumcision, whereas the true circumcision was not "that which was in the visible, in the flesh, but the circumcision of the heart, in spirit not in written ordinance." Rom. ii. 28, 29. Similarly the true service of God is "in newness of the Spirit, not in oldness of written law," Rom. vii. 6. There is no justification whatever for taking 'letter' in the sense of a letter of the alphabet nor for the

Digitized by Google

7 But if the ministration of death, written *and* engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done away:

8 How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?

9 For if the ministration of condemnation *be* glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.

10 For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth.

11 For if that which is done away *was* glorious, much more that which remaineth *is* glorious.

12 Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great [1]plainness of speech:

[1] Or, *boldness.*

---

application of it, so often made, to literal as opposed to spiritual interpretations of the Gospel.

The third point of contrast is that the written enactment "**puts to death,** but the Spirit makes alive." '**Puts to death**' is better than *killeth* (A. V), for the process meant is judicial and the original often occurs for judicial execution. The superiority, already implied in the term 'new,' appears in the respective effects of the two dispensations. How the written law puts to death is fully explained in Rom. viii. 8-13. "The law is spiritual" (Rom. viii. 14) and was "ordained unto life," but it brought about, in the first instance, an effect at variance with its essential nature.

**7, 8.** Notwithstanding this superiority of the new dispensation over the old, the Jews vilified St. Paul's ministry and glorified their own, which they deemed that they held as the successors of Moses. But the glory of the respective ministries being as the glory of the respective dispensations, he proceeds to show how this question of comparative glory stands. The characteristics of the old ministry, death, written enactment, engraving on stones, were in their own nature *at variance* with glory, yet a glory too bright for human eyes, albeit a temporary one, was *imparted* to it, Exod. xxxiv. 29-35. "**Surely more**" shall a ministry of the Spirit, whose characteristics, righteousness, life, peace (Rom. viii. 6) are in their own nature glorious, "**be in glory,**" and that not a temporary but a permanent glory. The glory of Spirit is in fact as imperishable as Spirit. The Apostle says "*shall* **be in glory**" because he is looking forward to the Messiah's kingdom, in which the glory now hidden shall be manifested. The original for the '*was glorious*' of the A. V. in ver. 7 means 'was brought' or 'made to pass into a state of glory' and implies that the glory was extrinsic and communicated. It might almost be rendered 'was glorified.'

**9.** "For if the ministration of condemnation **had a glory,** much more does the ministration of righteousness **superabound** in glory." (The right reading is τῇ διακονίᾳ). This second argument confirms the first by going one step further back in the stages of salvation and adducing a further contrast between the two ministries. Condemnation, which is antecedent to death, is wrought by the old, and righteousness, its opposite, antecedent to the spiritual life, by the new. The same relation between spirit, life, and righteousness is found in Rom. xiii. 10 "The spirit is life by reason of righteousness."

**10.** Justifies the claim to a superabundance of glory by a *general assertion* applicable to the case in point. "For" "that which **is glorified**" or more simply and forcibly, "**the glorified** is even stripped of its glory" or "deglorified **in this particular**" *of relative or comparative glory*, "on account of the glory which **surpasses.**" The surpassing glory of the new shines down the old with its overpowering splendour. The original lays the emphasis upon the deglorification.

**11.** The next argument corroborates the statement just made. The extinction of glory recalls the fading of the glory from the face of Moses, and it is now clear that he regarded its vanishing as a symbol of the transitoriness of the Mosaic ministry, for he applies here the same expression to the ministry which he applied to the glory: "**If** that which **is being done away had** (transitory) **passages of glory,** much more will **that which abideth be in** (permanent) **glory.**" The two prepositions of the original (διά) 'through' and (ἐν) 'in' do not *necessarily* express the difference between transitoriness and duration, but they *may* do so as a matter of language, and the distinction is too much in accordance with the context to be set aside. For the old ministry glory was a brief stage through which it travelled, for the new it was a fixed sphere of existence. The law ceased because the old ministry had fulfilled its purpose of educating men to Christ; the new ministry abides because the righteousness and life which it ministers are of eternal duration.

Digitized by Google

13 And not as Moses, *which* put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished:

14 But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which *vail* is done away in Christ.

15 But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart.

16 Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away.

---

**12.** The practical effect produced by the glory of his ministry upon his mode of discharging it. The glory, being progressive and eternal, is properly an object of *hope*, though that does not destroy its present reality or its present fruition. This hope enables him to use much boldness of speech:—1. In declaring all the truths of the Gospel without adulteration, reservation, or disguise; publishing that through it is received righteousness, the spirit, life, liberty, a transfiguration to Christ's glory (iii. 18). 2. In claiming for his ministry all that is due to it, triumphs (ii. 14–16), spirituality (iii. 2, 3), and imperishable glory. This unrestrained openness proceeds from his conviction that the future glory will substantiate his words.

**13.** That this privilege of unreserve was not equally vouchsafed to the old ministry is shewn allegorically. It is assumed for the purpose of the allegory, that the sons of Israel also, had they seen the gradual extinction of the glory on the face of Moses, would have regarded it as an emblem of transitoriness and have fixed their gaze unduly upon the termination of his ministry. With this is combined the idea that a premature discernment of this transitoriness by a people in spiritual infancy would have prevented the old ministry from taking its full effect as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. The impression given by Exod. xxxiv. 29–35 is that Moses put on the vail in order to enable the people to overcome their fear of approaching him. It is not however there stated that such was his object, and it appears from vv. 34, 35 that he spake with the people after coming out from the presence of the Lord while the glory was yet fresh upon his face after its renewal, and that he did not resume the vail until he had communicated the revelation which he had received. We must remember that the passage is allegorical and therefore exempted from strict historical criticism, as well as that the Apostle has in view, not Moses only, but the false teachers at Corinth who deliberately used a vail to hide the Gospel truth. Moses prophesied the Messiah and looked forward to a dispensation beyond his own (Deut. xviii. 15).

**14.** The effect produced by the vail. The strongly adversative conjunction (ἀλλά) requires a thought to be supplied. They did not see the end of that which was passing away, "but" on the contrary "**their thoughts got hardened**" (aorist). St. Paul does not say:—'Moses hardened their thoughts,' but "their thoughts got hardened." This was the exact opposite of the result produced by the Apostle's frank discharge of *his* office which inscribed the tablets of the heart with the spirit of the living God. The "thoughts" are the spiritual perceptions, discernments, intuitions. These lost their sensibility and quickness, and became callous. The effect of this vail of Moses upon the thoughts of the beholders is the transition-link to its transference to the hearts of the people in the next verse. There are two vails, of which one covers *first* the face of Moses personally and *next* Moses as read in the Pentateuch; the other lies upon the hearts of the Jews. The proof of the hardening of their spiritual perceptions is that it has lasted until the present time. The vail covers those written records of the old dispensation which represent Moses, and is said to remain "**upon** *the reading*" of them, because it was mainly by public reading in the synagogue that the Jews maintained their acquaintance with them. The vail continued "**not uplifted**," because it was in Christ that it was (to be) done away, and the Jews had not yet been converted to Christ. He is speaking of the national conversion, the salvation of all Israel, which is treated at length in Romans xi.

**15.** Here, again, we have to supply a thought, as in v. 14. The vail is not uplifted, "but," on the contrary, "to this day **a** vail lies upon their heart." The Apostle, in holding to the figure of the vail, is aware that he is using it in a rather different sense from that which it has in vv. 13, 14. So he says not "*the vail*" A. V. but "**a** vail." This vail upon their hearts is equivalent to the hardening of their thoughts, for, as this hardening was the result of the vail upon the face of Moses *personally*, so the vail upon their hearts was the result of the vail upon Moses *read*. The heart is *the seat* of the

Digitized by Google

17 Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord *is*, there *is* liberty.

18 But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even* as [1]by the Spirit of the Lord.

[1] Or, *of the Lord the Spirit.*

---

*thoughts* and spiritual vision. The right reading and rendering in Eph. i. 18, is "the eyes of the heart."

**16.** The means of being stripped of the vail is conversion to the Lord. "**But whensoever** it shall turn to the Lord, **it is stripped of its vail.**" Both the form of thought and the language are borrowed from Exodus xxxiv. 34. "But when Moses went in before the Lord to speak to him, he used to strip off the vail until he came out." The Lord is not God the Father (as Pearson on the Creed, Art. viii.) but Christ, as is clear from the statement that the vail is to be done away in Christ. The subject of "shall turn" is the heart mentioned in the last verse. That it is not usual in the N.T. to speak of the heart turning to Christ is not a sufficient reason for supplying a new subject such as 'Israel' or 'all Israel' according to Rom. xi. 26. The practical drift of this verse is that the Jewish Christians should turn with their whole heart to the Lord, whom St. Paul preached, and not be drawn away from Him by false teachers.

**17.** When the heart is stripped of its vail, the screen between it and the Lord is removed. The Lord obtains access to the heart and communicates Himself to it. "But the Lord is **the** Spirit." When he communicates Himself therefore, He communicates the Spirit. It is clear from Rom. viii. 9, 10 that the expressions 'the spirit of God being in' men, 'the spirit of Christ being in' men, and 'Christ being in' men, signify the same thing. At the root of this variety of representation lies the truth that "The Lord is **the** spirit." The connection shews that this proposition declares Christ the Lord to be the Spirit so far as Christ's being and working in us is concerned. The Spirit in us is Christ in us, and Christ in us is the Spirit in us. "**But** where the Spirit is there is liberty." The context compels us to interpret this liberty as freedom from the bondage of the Law, which freedom however when analysed amounts in reality to Christian liberty in its entire scope, the glorious liberty of the children of God. St. Paul regarded the Law with all the reverence due to a divine institution and his seemingly disparaging expressions are only applicable when it is put into competition with the Gospel.

**18.** "But we all with **unvailed** face beholding as in a **mirror** the glory of the Lord are **transfigured** to the same image, as from a **Lord** (who is) **Spirit.**" This is the crowning glory of the new ministry. In contrast (δέ) with the unconverted, heart-vailed, enslaved Israel, all those who through conversion to "the Lord who is the Spirit" have come into their liberty as sons of God, enjoy unclouded communion with Christ. They see Him with the face of their inner man unvailed. As the true Christ is Christ glorified, it is the *glory of the Lord* that they thus behold. With this unobstructed gaze a metamorphosis begins by which they are transfigured to the "same" image which the Lord Himself wears. The transfiguration is progressive, it advances from one stage of glory to another. This transmutation is exactly a suitable result to proceed from one who is spirit. Glory is of the essence of spirit and is the outward form in which spirit manifests itself. The future spiritual body or rather 'body fit to be the organ of spirit,' in 1 Cor. xv. 44, is the same as the 'body of glory' in Phil. iii. 21. All this besides its polemical purport is put forth as an inducement to those Jewish Christians at Corinth who were in danger of being led back into the servitude of the Law, to turn wholly to Him, who by removing the vail from their hearts could make them also recipients of spirit, liberty, and glory. That the word rendered "beholding as in a mirror" is capable of this sense is clear from an interesting passage in Philo. Alleg. p. 79 E. That the meaning "reflecting as in a mirror" is either impossible or would yield no sense is scarcely correct. What decides in favour of the former sense is that "with unvailed face" expresses unhindered, as the vail upon the heart in v. 15 expresses hindered *vision.*

The mirror cannot mean either the Gospel or the heart. The idea apparently is that the glorified Saviour is realised by the spiritual vision as clearly as in a burnished mirror (iii. 14). Certainly the Apostle explains 'seeing through a glass' (in 1 Cor. xiii. 12) as seeing 'in an enigma' or darkly, but that does not prevent a mirror from being used as a figure for clearness of view, which indeed the context here requires. That the words rendered in the A.V. "*even as by the Spirit of the Lord*" should be translated "**as from a Lord** (who is) **Spirit**" seems almost certain from the immediately foregoing phrase, "The Lord is the Spirit," and from the appropriate sense which it furnishes.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *He declareth how he hath used all sincerity and faithful diligence in preaching the gospel,* 7 *and how the troubles and persecutions which he daily endured for the same did redound to the praise of God's power,* 12 *to the benefit of the church,* 16 *and to the apostle's own eternal glory.*

THEREFORE seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not;

2 But have renounced the hidden things of [1]dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

[1] Gr. *shame.*

3 But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost:

4 In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

---

CHAP. IV. There should be no division of chapters, for the same topic and reasoning are continued to ver. 7.

**1.** The persons addressed are still those whom he hopes to save from Judaism and to whom therefore he must justify fully his Apostleship and his mode of exercising it. "**On this account,**" i.e. because of the transcendent superiority of his ministry, holding it not by self-appointment, but having received it, utterly unworthy as he was (1 Cor. xv. 9), by an act of God's mercy, he does not fail in the courage which both the mercy and the ministry demand of him. He claims for his office all the glory that belongs to it and he preaches boldly the pure Gospel whatever it may cost him (iii. 12).

**2.** He turns now from the misguided Jewish Christians to their false teachers, referred to also in ii. 17. He does not fail in courage, "but" on the contrary (ἀλλά), when God made him an Apostle, he **renounced** (aor.) "the hidden practices of shame." The "hidden" refers to the vail, yet the whole expression does not of course apply to the great lawgiver, but only to his professed successors in Corinth. When he says that *he* 'renounced' these things, he does not mean that he ever practised them, but that he foreswore them. He explains what he renounced, and what his adversaries practised, in the expressions, "not walking in **crafty villany**, nor **yet falsifying** the word of God." By the first he means all the covert and cleverly devised calumnies, intrigues, and manœuvres employed to ruin him in Corinth, which would not bear the light of day (τὰ κρυπτά); by the second, the adulteration of the Gospel with elements of the law, tradition, or false notions of Christ's person and character. This course his adversaries followed because it appealed strongly to Jewish prejudices (Gal. vi. 12). He pursued an opposite line which required no little courage. With open manifestation of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as a minister of the Spirit and a preacher of a spiritual Gospel, he commended himself to that faculty in man which is most akin to spirit, conscience. He appealed to this least corruptible of tribunals in its least corruptible form, not as it exists in individuals or sections, or even in a nation, in which it is liable to be perverted by feeling and passion, but "**to all conscience of men,**" to that general witness of Himself which God has planted in mankind. This he did, knowing that God was cognizant of his proceedings, and therefore feeling that He approved them.

**3.** But instead of his Gospel actually commending itself to the general conscience of men, the Judaizers said that it was as much "**vailed**" to them as he said the Law was to the Jews. If so, this was not due to the nature of his Gospel but to the spiritual condition of those by whom it was not understood. "**It is among those that are perishing that it is vailed.**" They were on the road to perdition, and as he said in ii. 15, 16 to such persons he and his Gospel were "an odour from death unto death."

**4.** Assigns the reason why to those that are perishing his Gospel was vailed. "In whom the **God of this age blinded the thoughts of the unbelievers.**" The term "unbelievers" designates according to the *occasion of their blindness*, the same persons who are described according to the *state and destiny of their souls*, in the words: "those that are perishing." It was their unbelief which gave Satan his hold upon them. When salvation by faith was offered to the Jews, those who refused it thereby constituted themselves unbelievers. Through this act of unbelief they fell under Satan's power and he '**blinded**' (not '*hath blinded*' as in the A. V.) their faculties of spiritual perception. Thus they were brought into a perishing state in which St. Paul's Gospel was vailed to them. It is said that spiritual blindness cannot be the

Digitized by Google

5 For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.

6 For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to *give* the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

---

result of unbelief. Why not? The successive steps in the opposite case of the believer are exactly analogous. He accepts reconciliation by faith, and so is a believer. As a believer there is communicated to him the Holy Spirit, whose influence is the opposite of Satan's, and who enlightens his powers of spiritual discernment. He is in a state of progressive salvation (σωζόμενος) and St. Paul's Gospel is to him not vailed, but an odour from life unto life. Satan is called the "**God of this age**" (aeon), because the period preceding the Saviour's advent was regarded as one of extreme wickedness and peculiarly under Satan's dominion. The power of spiritually blinding is a proper attribute of one whose element is darkness. Satan's object was to prevent from "**shedding its brightness** the **illumining** of the Gospel of the glory of Christ." The words '*unto them*' of the A. V. have no right in the text. The verb of the original (αὐγάζειν) means 'to be bright,' 'to shine,' in Lev. xiii. 25–28, 30; xiv. 56. The context requires this sense here, for the main idea of ver. 6 is a light shining in the heart. The word rendered '*light*' in the A. V. means "**illumining**," and denotes not the illumining which the Gospel receives, but that which accompanies and flows from it, when faithfully preached. "The Gospel of the glory of Christ" is that which has the glory of Christ for its substance, and it is a specific designation of St. Paul's Gospel as contrasted with that of the Judaizers. "Who is the image of God" heightens the idea of the glory of Christ, and further shows that in the transformation of iii. 18 the image to which we are assimilated is no other than God's. The mention of God indicates the consistency of Satan, God's "adversary" in blinding men to God's image; and that this should be *Satan's* work was well calculated to alarm the misguided Jewish Christians. If the vailing of St. Paul's Gospel was thus due to Satan, it was a proof that it was the true Gospel.

N.B. There is much in favour of the view that the "**age**" meant in the title "**God of this age**" began with the time when Satan brought sin into the world through the first Adam, thereby gaining a dominion over men and a power of blinding them to divine truth. If so, "this age" means the period during which Satan's power remains what it is. Still it is better not to render αἰών by 'world,' which term more properly belongs to κόσμος, but how closely the two Greek words approach each other in *idea* appears from Satan's designation "The prince of this world," John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, and their combination in Eph. ii. 2. Αἰών has, in any case, an interesting analogue in the Latin 'seculum' (age) as used by Tacitus, which is fairly reproduced by 'the world':—'corrumpere et corrumpi seculum vocatur.' For the restriction of αἰών to the period immediately antecedent to Christ's Advent see Grimm. Lex. Αἰών. 3.

**5.** We preach the Gospel of Christ's glory, "for" the accusation that we preach ourselves is not true. Such a disclaimer he never would have made, had the charge not been actually brought against him. It probably meant: 1. That *his* Christ was not Christ as He was known upon earth, but one whom he had fashioned out of his own imagination. 2. He had put himself so prominently forward in his preaching as to become its chief subject. He set forth his own example for imitation, 1 Cor. vii. 6, 7; iv. 16, xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 4; iii. 9; Gal. iv. 12; Phil. iii. 17. He said that he had 'the mind of Christ.' Other points might have been similarly perverted. The misrepresentation is echoed in the Clementine Homilies, where St. Peter is made to state that Christ must be preceded by Antichrist and then identifying Simon Magus, the representative of St. Paul in these Homilies, with Antichrist, he adds that "being death," he has been desired "*as if he were a Saviour*." All this was not true, "but," on the contrary, (ἀλλά) he preached "**Christ as Lord.**" The title "**Lord**" implies the "All power in heaven and upon earth" which was given to Christ" Matt. xxviii. 18; the Lordship over the dead and the living, to obtain which, St. Paul says, "Christ both died and rose and revived" (Rom. xiv. 9.) Thus to preach Him as Lord is to preach Him crucified, risen, exalted, glorified, wherein is brought out once more the antithesis between the Apostle and the Judaizers. The epitome of the Christian confession is "Christ is the Lord" (Rom. xiv. 18).

The only mode in which St. Paul preached himself was as a "servant" of his readers, yet a servant only "for the sake of Jesus." Though he was free from all men, yet he made himself servant unto all that he might gain the more for Christ (1 Cor. ix. 19). It is not unlikely that the term 'servant' or, more accurately, 'slave' is in contrast with the arrogant and violent behaviour of the Judaizing leaders (2 Cor. xi. 20).

Digitized by Google

7 But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.

8 *We are* troubled on every side, yet not distressed; *we are* perplexed, but [1]not in despair;

9 Persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed;

10 Always bearing about in the

[1] Or, *not altogether without help*, or, *means.*

---

**6.** States the reason why it is impossible for him to preach himself in any other capacity than that of a servant, or to preach any one else except Christ as Lord. "Because the God who **said** 'out of darkness **light shall shine**' (λάμψει) **is He who shone for the illumining** of the knowledge . . ." The God whose 'fiat lux' caused light to shine out of darkness in the physical creation, shone out of Jewish darkness in a new spiritual creation in the Apostle's heart. The allusion to his conversion is obvious. The scales which fell from his bodily eyes at Damascus were but types of those which fell from the eyes of his spirit. What was revealed to him was "the glory of God in the face of Christ," God's image, whom he saw in His glorified form at his conversion. The express object which the shining of God in his heart was to serve was the "illumining" or the luminous diffusion amongst men of the knowledge of this glory. See Acts ix. 15 and compare Gal. i. 16. When God had so converted him and so disclosed to him the object of his conversion, how could he do otherwise than preach Christ as Lord and the express image of the Father's perfection, or himself as anything else than the servant of the Church for Christ's sake? With this striking verse he quits for the present the glory of his ministry. The practical hint to the Jews at Corinth is that they must be divested of the vail, as he was delivered from his darkness. They must turn to the same glorious Christ, revealed in his preaching, as was revealed, in a different manner, to the Apostle himself.

**7-18.** From the bright side St. Paul turns to the dark. Is not the pretension to inward and unseen glory contradicted by the visible facts of his bodily existence? The glory of Moses dazzled the eye. Christ had His hour of manifested splendour in the mount of Transfiguration. Nothing of a like kind attached to St. Paul. He had only a mean body, afflicted by a peculiar infirmity and stigmatised with traces of suffering, which were regarded as the marks of God's disapprobation. That his physical condition was one of humiliation he does not deny, but only places this fact in its true light and answers the false and wicked misconstructions put upon it by his enemies.

The substance of his argument up to the end of the chapter is:—i. It is God's purpose that His instruments for spreading the Gospel should be weak, the power by which it triumphs his own, 7-9. ii. In the alternation of deadly sufferings and deliverances, the Apostle is a veritable illustration in his own body of the crucifixion-death and the resurrection-life of Christ, 10-11. Such a bond with his master is a high comfort and an answer to all hostile taunts. iii. His bodily afflictions tend to other men's salvation, 12-15. iv. They work out for him an eternal weight of glory, 16-18.

**7.** "**Hold**" would be a rather better rendering than '*have*' and "**excess**" than '*excellence*.' The treasure is the glorious ministry described in the last verse, not excluding the glory which he has in common with all believers according to iii. 18. The earthenware vessel, which is not the whole man (v. 16) but only the body, expresses the absence of beauty and solidity, such as belong to vessels of gold and silver, and the liability to defacement, breakage, and destruction. It is scarcely necessary to say that this does not imply a general baseness of the body. The reference is to the Apostle's body in particular and Christianity knows nothing of a "fastidium corporis," but insists upon the true dignity of the body, which is 'the sanctuary of the Holy Ghost' here, and destined to glory hereafter. The power is that by which the Gospel is spread through the Apostolic ministry. The "**excess**" means not only that the power is exceedingly great in itself, but that it greatly preponderates over all resistance. God *intended* that this power should be His, for had He used as His ministers the great ones of the earth, it might have seemed that the Gospel was established by human agency. But it was clear that the work was God's, when the organs employed were frail and worn.

**8, 9.** Four pairs of contrasts illustrate the frailty of the instruments and the excess of the power, as shown in St. Paul's experience. 1. Crushed, but not penned into a corner. The idea is that of being jostled in a crowd (Mark iii. 9). They are hard pressed for space, but not driven into hopeless straits. 2. In difficulties as to the ways and means of carrying on their ministry effectually, but not reduced to utter helplessness. 3. Persecuted, but not left in the enemy's hands; not given over to the persecutors. 4. Thrown to the ground, but not

body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.

11 For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.

12 So then death worketh in us, but life in you.

13 We having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, [a] I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak;

[a] Ps. 116. 10.

---

destroyed. The notion is the pursuit of a fugitive in war, who when overtaken and thrown down is usually slain. Here was the overthrow but, by God's grace, not the slaughter. The first pair of these contrasts refer to circumstantial difficulties: the second to the animosity of enemies.

**10.** This and the following verse put the coping stone upon the preceding antitheses and show besides in how intimate a relation to Christ the Apostle stands through these sufferings and survivings. "*Bearing about*" refers to the earthenware vessels and describes with great force the incessant activity and the world-wide travel of the Apostle's missionary life. "The putting to death" or rather "the doing to death," if such a phrase could be used, would be a more correct rendering than "*the dying*," as the original denotes the process of 'making a corpse,' but it has no exact English equivalent. The idea is exactly the same as that of the "sufferings of Christ" (i. 5), except that these sufferings are here restricted to the body (cf. Gal. vi. 17), and are represented in the culminating and deadly form in which they are the analogue of the Lord's crucifixion. There is a communion of bodily death between the Lord Jesus and His confessors, and the object of this is that there may also be a manifested communion of bodily life between Him and them. The putting to death never comes to actual death, because it is always arrested by the intervention of that very same power of life by which Christ rose from the dead. The continual deliverance of the Apostle from death is a standing and visible miracle of resurrection and a testimony to the world that the progress of the Gospel is God's work. The Judaizers had no such communion with Christ as this. They escaped persecution by preaching a legal Gospel (Gal. vi. 12).

**11.** Explanatory. "*Always*," which is emphatic and begins the verse in the original, shows more distinctly that the being put to death is not a thing undergone once for all, but a continually renewed process. He dies daily. "**We the living**," which is rather more pointed than "*we which live*" serves in part the same purpose, signifying that he is maintained in life only to be handed over to death again. It perhaps also expresses, by placing life in close juxtaposition with death, the terrible character of these trials in which living men are face to face with death. The original word for "*are delivered*" is the same which is used of Judas Iscariot's "handing over" Jesus to His Roman executioners. Christ applies it both to himself and his disciples (Luke xxi. 12). It means strictly 'are being handed over.' It is a regular term for delivery over to justice and punishment. "*For Jesus sake*" helps to identify the putting to death with that of Christ and is the connecting-link between putting to death and manifestation of the life of Jesus. The strong phrase "*in our mortal flesh*," in an emphatic position at the end of the verse and substituted for "*in our body*" of v. 10, indicates how deeply the resurrection-life of Christ penetrated in the Apostle's physical organism. It communicated a living power and a kind of imperishableness to the very substance of the body, to the flesh which is essentially mortal and corruptible. A very striking statement this is.

**12.** The result of the above considerations is: "**the** death **takes effect** in us, but **the** life in you." Though his physical vitality is maintained, nevertheless his deadly sufferings work and tell upon him in the gradual enfeebling and marring of his frame (v. 16) His ever-renewed life, on the other hand, has its effective operation among the Corinthians, who thereby have their spiritual riches increased out of the treasure which he carries in the battered earthenware vessel. He has all the worst; they all the best. They should therefore be the last persons in the world to despise him for his wasted frame.

**13.** The connection is, 'but though death works in us, we have that which prevents us from being silenced.' He illustrates his meaning by quoting from the LXX. Ps. cxvi. 10, very briefly, because the passage, being part of the little Hallel, was familiar to Jewish readers at any rate. Psalms cxiv. and cxv. according to the LXX. constitute Psalm cxvi. according to the Hebrew version, and they certainly seem, in matter, to constitute only one composition. The writer had been in imminent peril of life, and in consequence of *his belief* in God's protection, he spake in prayer for deliverance. Having obtained it,

Digitized by Google

14 Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present *us* with you.

15 For all things *are* for your sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God.

16 For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward *man* is renewed day by day.

---

he proclaimed the mercy and righteousness of God, and declared that he should be *well-pleasing to God in the land of the living.* Similarly the Apostle, having faith, confirmed by experience, that he will be delivered from his deadly trials further to serve God in the land of the living, does not allow his sufferings to stop his speaking. The original word for "speaking" is used for preaching (Phil. i. 14; Col. iv. 3, 4; 1 Thess. ii. 2, 4, 16), and the "mercy and righteousness" of God which the Psalmist proclaimed, when invested with their Christian sense, are in a large measure the subject-matter of the Gospel. There is, however, no need to exclude his bold speaking (iii. 12) about his ministry. "The spirit of faith" may denote that temper or frame of mind of which faith is the characteristic (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 12, 1 Pet. iii. 4, and Grimm Lex. on *πνεῦμα*, p. 356), but it is usually understood to signify the Holy Spirit, according to which view, faith must be taken mainly in the sense of trust in God which the Spirit fosters. "The same" either means the same Spirit which actuated the writer of the Psalm, or there is a slight irregularity of expression for "the same spirit which is according to the passage of Scripture," *i.e.* the same Spirit of faith which found utterance in the passage of Scripture:—"I believed; wherefore I spake."

**14.** Whether the knowledge here is the faith of the last verse in its completer form of assurance or the basis of the trust implied in faith, it is the ground for his continued persevering in preaching. What the Apostle knows is that "God . . . . will raise up us also **with** (*σύν*) Jesus and present us with you." It is impossible that the reference can be to the resurrection of the body at the Parousia, for St. Paul was persuaded, when he wrote the First Epistle that he should live until the Lord's coming, and there is no indication in the Second that his view had undergone any change, nor was this possible in so short an interval. The idea is still that of preserving him alive by raising his moribund body from sufferings which would otherwise destroy it. This takes place "**with** Jesus," because it is in virtue of his *communion of life with* the Lord, *i.e.* by the very same power of God, which raised Christ from the dead, that the deliverance is effected. The verb "present" occurs often in St. Paul. He looks forward with pride (ii. 14) to his function of presenting the Church to the Saviour at His advent as a pure bride, 2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 6; Col. i. 22. In the verse before us *God* will present to Christ the Apostle, as the paranymph, or bridegroom's man, together with the bride. His life will be prolonged for that great event. In Eph. v. 27, Christ is said to present the Church to Himself, and in Col. i. 22, according to one view, the members of the Church present themselves to Him. These variations have their analogies in other cases.

**15.** He has said "with you," for all his dying and reviving is for their sake. As God's providential dealings with the ministers of the Gospel generally were for the salvation of mankind, so His protection of St. Paul in particular was for the sake of those who were the special objects of his ministerial care. The statement resembles that of i. 6, and the object which God has in view is the same with that described in the latter part of i. 11. "In order that the grace **having abounded** may," through the greater number of those who will benefit by it, "**make thanksgiving to superabound.**" "The grace" is the continual deliverance from death, as is "the gift" in i. 12. Its "having abounded" consists in its being amply and always vouchsafed. The original means:—'having come to greater increase.' The longer he is spared, the greater will be the number of persons won to Christ or confirmed in Christ, and the greater the company of thanksgivers. The rendering of thanks and glory to God for the inestimable benefits received through Christ implies the restoration of the true relation between God and man and is, according to the Apostle's view, the end and aim of everything in this world.

**16.** With the attainment of this great object before him, he does not lose courage, but, on the contrary, amidst the wear and tear of suffering, he receives a continual accession of strength. He admits, as in v. 12, that his natural man undergoes, in spite of its revival through Christ's life, a gradual waste. But to compensate for this a counter-process is going on which he calls "a day-by-day renewal of the inner man." The phrase "outward man" occurs only here. The "inward man" is spoken of in Rom. vii. 2 and

Digitized by Google

17 For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding *and* eternal weight of glory;

18 While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen *are* temporal; but the things which are not seen *are* eternal.

---

Eph. iii. 16. In both passages it denotes not the whole of man's immaterial nature, but its highest part, through which he is receptive of divine influences, of illumination, of becoming a new creature, and of which the representative faculty in the natural man is *νοῦς* or reason. The idea of 'renewal' occurs in three other places in St. Paul, and in two out of the three is expressly applied to this faculty of man's nature. Rom. xii. 2; 2 Eph. iv. 23; Col. iii. 11. The meaning in the verse before us is not that he is receiving new supplies of resolution, courage, energy, enabling him to continue his work with intensified vigour, but that the spiritual man according to Col. iii. 10, is "*renewed*. . . . according to the image of Him that created him." In other words the transfiguration of iii. 18 is daily advancing. His argument is on its way to the final stage of that transfiguration, which is the glorification of the body, when the earthen vessel shall have fallen to pieces.

**17.** The explanation of these two opposite processes going on simultaneously is that the same affliction which works the physical waste works also the spiritual renewal. It is almost impossible to reproduce the force of the original, in which the language labours under the load of glory. "The **momentary lightness** of our affliction worketh for us in a **surpassing manner to a surpassing result** an eternal weight of glory." The spirit of faith which realises the substance of things not seen inverts the usual relation of ideas. Affliction, generally regarded as a load, has here the quality of lightness. Glory, generally regarded as an etherial splendour, is a weight. The affliction is not light in itself, but only when put in the balance with the weight, nor momentary in itself, but only when set against eternity. As the word for "worketh" also means 'earns,' Roman Catholic expositors use the passage to support their doctrine of a merit of condignity. The idea in the Apostle's mind is that the sufferings of Christ borne by his ministers and followers lead them to glory, even as they led Christ Himself to glory, because they are always accompanied by rich supplies of the Spirit and life. Rom. viii. 17, 18, is the parallel to this passage:—"If we suffer with Him, that we also may be glorified with Him." Compare Heb. ii. 9, 10. *Compensation* for affliction does not seem to be any part of the meaning, and it is even doubtful whether the *moral* working of tribulation described in Rom. v. 3, 4, 5, is comprised. He is speaking rather of the *immediate* communication of Christ's spirit and life to those who bear His sufferings, which in the forthcoming Kingdom will reveal itself in glory. In the expression "weight of glory" one is tempted to think that he is anticipating the figure of raiment used in the next chapter for the glorified body, and that the conception is that of a royal robe heavy with costly embroidery of gold and silver. The phrase was probably suggested by an etymological connection between the Hebrew terms for 'weight' and 'glory.'

**18.** It is scarcely in harmony with the loftiness of the context to suppose that the Apostle here inserts a precautionary condition, under which alone affliction works glory. Nor does the subjective negative of the original at all necessitate this view. He describes the mental attitude, the direction of the gaze of himself and others, which accompanies and in part accounts for the maintenance of courage (v. 16), the renewal of the inward man, and the working out of glory by affliction. They do not contemplate as the end and goal of their career the things which are seen, but the things which are not seen. The things which are seen are this visible world with its circumstances and experiences, whether they bring with them earthly good, or such evil as extreme bodily suffering. The things which are not seen are the future Kingdom with all its glorious circumstances and mode of existence, not excluding the body of glory itself. The reason for fixing the view upon the things not seen and averting it from the seen, is that the gaze at the eternal qualifies, the gaze at the temporary disqualifies, men for glory.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER V.

1 *That in his assured hope of immortal glory,* 9 *and in expectance of it, and of the general judgment, he laboureth to keep a good conscience,* 12 *not that he may herein boast of himself,* 14 *but as one that, having received life from Christ, endeavoureth to live as a new creature to Christ only,* 18 *and by his ministry of reconciliation to reconcile others also in Christ to God.*

FOR we know that if our earthly house of *this* tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

2 For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven :

---

CHAP. V. He further explains the eternal unseen as the object of his gaze and the ground of his unflagging courage (v. 6). The transition link between the unseen things and the body of glory is eternity (iv. 18; v. 1), which seems to be the last step of the ladder upon which his thoughts have climbed from the earthen vessel to the incorruptible body.

1. "For we know that, **if our tent-dwelling upon earth should be pulled down**, we have an **edifice** from God, a dwelling . . . . . ." Part of his knowledge of the body of glory may have been derived from his having *seen* the glorified Saviour, who was the first-fruits of the resurrection. The tent-dwelling designates the body as the abode of persons not in their own country, but making a pilgrimage in a foreign land and carrying with them a slight provisional shelter. He did not think that death either by violence or in the course of nature would take down his earthly tabernacle. He only supposes the case of death, which was always *possible* for himself and other believers. Should that case occur, the comfort is that there is a better body in reserve. The view that he takes for granted the dissolution of his natural body in any case, because this is implied in change as well as in death, identifies dissolution or pulling down (καταλυθῇ) with absorption or swallowing up (καταποθῇ), which are different processes. An undue pressure of the present tense "we have," has suggested the mechanical theory that the body of glory exists *now* in heaven, in an organic form. St. Paul's use of present tenses when he is speaking vividly of things future that are certain has already been mentioned. In the indwelling spirit here we *have* the assured possession of glory hereafter, the difference being only that between latency and manifestation. "**Edifice**" denotes a durable and stately building, and is applied to the splendid structures of the temple in Mark xiii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 1. It denotes also a building in course of erection. (1 Cor. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 21.) In both points it aptly describes the future body, for it will have a solidity of glory (iv. 17) which is even now growing with the growth of the inner man. In virtue of its immediate divine origin it will possess the attributes ascribed to it in 1 Cor. xv. which may be summed up in one phrase :—'fit to be the organ of spirit' (σῶμα πνευματικόν), whereas the natural body is only 'fit to be the organ of soul' (σῶμα ψυχικόν). "Not made with hands" seems to have an antithetical reference not to the natural body itself, but only to the figure of the tent which represents it. The phrase however appears to have passed away from its literal signification into a more general one. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, explains it (Heb. ix. ii.), as meaning 'not of this creation or world,' i.e. not belonging to this visible and perishable, but to the heavenly and imperishable world. Elsewhere, as in Col. ii. 11 (cf. Eph. ii. 11) it is equivalent to spiritual. In either or both of these senses it is very applicable to the future body. A comparison of Mark xiv. 58 with John ii. 19–21 might almost induce one to think that it came to be used of the Lord's resurrection body, regarded figuratively as a Temple.

2. Corroborates that which he knows about the future body by his sensations in the present body. "**For in fact in this** (tent) we groan, **longing to put on over it our habitation**, which is from heaven." He longs to put on the new body by change according to 1 Cor. xv. 51. He is already clothed with the corruptible body and, if he should assume the incorruptible before he has been divested of the corruptible, the process will be a superinvestiture or putting on of an over-garment. If his yearning thus to put on the more excellent body is so strong that he cannot prevent it from finding utterance in groans, it is a ground for the conviction that there is such a body and a confirmation of his knowledge, because all *natural* desires, and especially desires which are expressly wrought in man by God (v. 5) must have a real corresponding outward object. A similar argument is found in Rom. viii. 18–24. The term rendered "**habitation**" means properly the "place-of-a dweller," and denotes an abode which belongs more peculiarly to the occupant than the tent-house does. Some such expression as 'home-house' might give its



Digitized by Google

3 If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked.

4 For we that are in *this* tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not

force. The transition from a tent to raiment is easy, especially as the tent spoken of is one adapted to a single person. The fabrication of hair-cloth for tents was the Apostle's secular occupation. The words "from heaven" denote the region out of (ἐξ) which the body of glory is immediately to come. This and some other intimations almost seem to countenance the conjecture that our Lord will bring with him from heaven at His advent some glorious element or substance, essentially different from all earthly matter, possessing a splendour like that of light, in which God manifested himself under the old dispensation, and which glorified the Saviour's person in His Transfiguration, and that the dead and living saints will, in virtue of their communion with Christ and the possession of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 11), instantaneously appropriate and assimilate this substance, and thereby put on bodies differing from one another in glory according to the forms and degrees of their previous spiritual development. The relation between the heavenly and the natural body, in the case of the dead, may be that there remains after death, we know not where, some spiritualised nucleus of the natural body, analogous to the germ of life in a grain of wheat, upon and around which the body of glory will be fashioned and organised.

N. B. There is some doubt as to the exact rendering of the first clause of this verse on account of difference of opinion amongst scholars as to the force of the combined particles καὶ γάρ. Some good authorities, as Hartung and Meyer, lay down a strict rule that they always mean 'for even' or 'for also,' but it is quite certain that they cannot always be so rendered. The καί here lays emphasis upon the reason introduced by the γάρ, lifting it in a measure to the same level of importance with that of which it is the reason and may be rendered by some such expression as 'in fact.' 'We know that there is a glorious body for *in fact* we groan with ardent longing for it.' A feeling of the heart, while it is adduced to confirm the consciousness of the thinking mind, is, at the same time, almost co-ordinated with it in importance as an argument.

**3.** Explains by a brief parenthesis the phrase "**put on over**" which was probably not so intelligible to his readers as it now is to us, although he had treated the point which it touches in 1 Cor. xv. The sense is:—'I say put on over, on the supposition, **of course, that, when we do actually put on**, we shall not be found naked.' If Christ shall find him at His Advent not divested of his natural body by death but still alive, his assumption of the new body will be a superinvestment, a process like that of putting on an upper garment. See additional note at the end of the chapter.

**4.** After the parenthesis he naturally reverts to the contents of the preceding verse and, recommencing almost with the same words, exhibits the groaning from a somewhat different point of view. It is prompted not only by a longing for the more excellent body, but also by a sense of oppression in "**the tent-dwelling**," which term itself shows wherein the burdensomeness of the present body consists. It is too slight a shelter against sufferings, too fragile an instrument for the work of his ministry. On account of this disparity between it and what it had to bear and to do, it became a kind of burden which he had to drag about with him. Some think that he had in his mind his peculiar bodily affliction. Under such circumstances, it might be expected that he would long to be released by death. But not so, for he adds "**whereupon**" or "**on which ground**" (ἐφ' ᾧ) "**we do not wish for divestment, but for superinvestment.**" To suppose that he here expresses a natural human shrinking from death would scarcely be in harmony with the context and would be unworthy of the Apostle. To wish that the treasure should be stripped of its earthen vessel would run counter to God's object and would shew a faint-hearted weariness of his Apostolic work, which is exactly what he disclaims. For these reasons he does not wish to put off the body, but only that the advent may come quickly and he may be changed. The object for which he desires this is "in order that **the mortal may** be swallowed up by life." "**The mortal**" may either mean 'mortality,' or 'the mortal body,' or 'the mortal element of the body.' On the whole the last rendering is the best, because there would seem to be some spiritualised centre of the body which is imperishable. There is apparently a reference in the figure to the contest between the two mighty antagonists life and death as described in iv. 10, 11, and in this case perhaps the rendering ought to be 'by *the* life.' He desires change in order that the alternations of this terrible and oppressive conflict (βαρούμενοι) may come to an end, when the life will be completely triumphant and swallow up that in the body upon which alone its adversary can take effect. The language is taken from Isaiah xxv. 8, where it is said of God that he "will swallow up death in victory." The original word means

Digitized by Google

for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.

5 Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing *is* God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit.

6 Therefore *we are* always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord:

7 (For we walk by faith, not by sight:)

8 We are confident, *I say*, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.

9 Wherefore we [1]labour, that,

[1] Or, *endeavour*.

---

'drink up,' which, when we attempt to apply the figure to the change, suggests the cognate term 'absorption.'

**5.** The sensations upon which his reasoning is based might be said to be purely fanciful or even be set down to what was called his madness. So he now guarantees them as a solid foundation for his anticipations. "**But he who wrought us to this very** (state) **is God.**" What God wrought him to was the inward groaning for superinvestment. No doubt, God wrought the inward spiritual fitness for it as well, but that is not, as some have thought, the point here meant. It was in fact part of God's design in committing the treasure to earthen vessels that the inadequacy of the vessels to their contents and their service should generate a strong desire for a better vehicle and organ. If God be the author of this great longing of the heart, there must be an objective reality corresponding to it, that is, there must be a body of glory with which believers who survive to the Advent will be over-clothed. "Who **gave** us the earnest of the spirit"—shews not only how God wrought him to the longing but also how infallible a guarantee he has of its being one day satisfied.

**6, 7, 8.** The event of either of the two possibilities, death (v. 1) or change, (vv. 2, 3, 4) must be a happy one for him. It follows that he is of good courage "**at all times,**" not only when, in the midst of suffering he contemplates the bright and as he was persuaded the probable issue of change, but also at times when death seemed imminent. Knowing 'that while he is at home in the body, he is absent from the Lord,' and that the moment he quits it he will be at home with the Lord, '**he thinks it good rather,**' that is, holds it preferable to migrate from the body and in a *disembodied* state to pass to the immediate presence of his divine master. He would fain remain at his post to the end but the better thing for him would be to depart. There is no inconsistency with anything just said. A man may easily long for one thing when he knows that another may be more for his own advantage. It is very interesting to compare this passage with Phil. i. 21–24, written at a later period and under different circumstances; still there is no contradiction but only a very natural modification of his feelings. What has obscured the sense of the verse before us is the idea that the original for "**we think good rather**" expresses a wish or something like it, as in the A.V. 'we are willing rather,' which is not correct.

The grammatical structure of 6, 7, 8, is a little irregular. He had at first intended to say:—'Being courageous and knowing . . . . we think it good rather.' But the parenthesis in v. 7, inserted as an explanation of the thing which he knew induced him to revert to the courage again in a slightly altered form. So his sentence runs thus:—'Being courageous and knowing . . . . for we walk **through** faith and not **through visible form,** we are courageous **I say** (δέ), and think it **good rather to emigrate** from the body **and to get home** (aorists) **to the Lord.**' Residence in the body is exile from the Lord and absence from the true home, for while the believer is in the body, the region, element or atmosphere through which he walks is one in which the heavenly things gazed upon are not seen in their actual substance, but only realised, as far as that is possible, by the spiritual discernment of faith (Heb. xi. 1). When he migrates to the Lord, he enjoys the sight of the things themselves. The Apostle leaves no doubt as to his own condition between death and the advent, should he be destined to die. He will pass into the immediate presence of Christ. We are fully justified in concluding that the *disembodied* spirits of all believers are translated after death into the glorified Saviour's presence. That St. Paul thought such a state of existence possible is clear from what he says in xii. 2. That he was "rapt as far as the third heaven," but "whether in the body or out of the body" he knew not.

**9.** These high anticipations and the inward warranty of their fulfilment do not lift him above the ordinary motives to duty. Whether he is to be changed or to die, he will go to the presence of the Lord (v. 8, and 1 Thess. iv. 17), upon his right relation to



Digitized by Google

whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him.

10 For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad.

11 Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences.

12 For we commend not ourselves again unto you, but give you occasion to glory on our behalf, that ye may

---

whom his future bliss depends. For this reason, besides thinking it good for him to go home to the Lord, he *also* (*καί*) entertains a desire, like the ardent aspiration after high honours and distinctions, to be the object of Christ's good pleasure, whether he remains in the body or migrates from it. "Wherefore we **are also ambitious, whether being at home or from home, to be well-pleasing to him.**" This is the strongest imaginable inducement to a courageous and faithful discharge of his ministry. "Haec una legitima ambitio." Notwithstanding the differences of expositors about this passage, it seems sufficiently clear. The "**ambition**" is felt *now*, and the object of it, Christ's approval, is to be enjoyed in either of two states, viz. continuance in the body or being at home with the Lord.

10. A good reason for his ambition is that, for all believers, himself included, either in the event of change or of death, the question whether they are well-pleasing to Christ or not, will come to open decision before His judgment-seat:—"We must all be **made manifest.**" The object of this public disclosure of character and conduct is "that each may **reap** the things done **during his bodily life-time,** according to what he **did** (during that time) whether (it was) good or evil." Men's actions are not spoken of as a number of items, but their conduct is taken as a whole, "whether good or evil." The question which will determine the future position of believers will be how far, after they have been reconciled through faith, the spirit of holiness has or has not been the regulating and fruitful principle of their lives. The expression implies that our *probation* terminates with our earthly existence. It is very probable that this allusion to the judgment is a warning to his unscrupulous enemies (cf. xi. 15), "whose end shall be according to their works."

11. His knowledge that Christ is to be feared as the future righteous judge prevents him from flagging in his work and from being indifferent to the good opinion of men about him, so far as this is essential to his ministerial success. This fear regulates all that he does and says to persuade men of the truth of the Gospel as preached by him, of his full authority to preach it, of his integrity and general blamelessness, so that in all his ministerial pleading with men for this end there is nothing which is unworthy of one ambitious to please Christ. The perusasion of men might indeed mean his efforts to convince them of the truth of the Gospel generally, to produce in them that Christian faith (*πίστις*) which is the fruit of his persuading (*πείθειν*). But his conduct in his office is the underlying topic of the whole context (iv. 16; v. 6, 8, 9), as it is of the greater part of the Epistle. To this the next expression *must* refer:—"but to God we are manifested." It is a clause antithetical to "we persuade men," as is quite clear from the contrast between "men" and "God." So the persuasion and the manifestation refer to the same matters. He must unhappily always be trying to accomplish with regard to men what is already accomplished with regard to God, by whom he is clearly seen as he truly is. "**But**" (not '*and*' A.V.) there is also a power of discernment in the hearts of his readers, not easily distorted or corrupted, conscience; and he hopes, more than a hope he does not venture to express, that, to this faculty in them also (*καί*), as well as to God, however much enemies may have tried to blind it, he is apparent in his true character.

12. Since his last disclaimer of self-commendation in iii. 1 he has furnished abundant materials which might serve his enemies for a reiteration of the charge; and the contents of the very last verse might easily be so misconstrued. But the immediate connection is probably this. He has just appealed to God and the consciences of his readers, and these are precisely the tribunals to which a self-commender does *not* appeal. So the thought "we are not commending ourselves again" suggested itself very naturally. The '*for*' of the A. V. is not countenanced by the best MSS. He is not commending himself, 'but' on the contrary, he says, '(we speak) **giving** you a **means of boast on our behalf, that you may have it** (to use) **against those who boast in person not in heart.**" The word 'occasion' of the A. V., although not incorrect, is rather weak. The original

Digitized by Google

have somewhat to *answer* them which glory [1]in appearance, and not in heart.

13 For whether we be beside ourselves, *it is* to God: or whether we be sober, *it is* for your cause.

14 For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge,

[1] Gr. *in the face.*

means a 'starting-point,' and in warfare, 'a base of operations.' It may often be rendered by 'handle,' but, as the Apostle is furnishing his readers with the substance of boast, 'means' or 'material' would reproduce his meaning better. The preposition of the original is slightly over-translated by 'against,' but it frequently gets this sense when connected with words and ideas of conflict and contention, as it is here. It is doubted whether the designation applied to the Apostle's enemies "**who boast in person, not in heart**" describes the nature of their boasting or the things of which they boast. The Greek favours the latter, but it is not decisive, as Hofmann says, who adopts the former view, which would require the rendering:—'who boast in appearance,' or 'semblance not in heart,' and the meaning would be that their boasting was hollow and hypocritical not real and sincere. The Apostle is however rather referring to the material of their boasting, and recourse must be had to the word 'person' in that sense in which it is said that "God is no respecter of persons" (Rom. ii. 2), and that "God accepteth not the person of man." The rendering then is, "who boast in **person, not in heart**," and the sense, that they boast of things which lie upon the surface and make up only the outer and apparent man, not those qualities which constitute the inner, moral, spiritual, Christian man. It is of these that St. Paul boasts, when driven to boasting, whereas his adversaries boasted of personal knowledge of Christ in the flesh, intercourse with the original Apostles, theocratic nationality, Hebrew descent, circumcision and so forth. This view is strongly supported by Gal. ii. 6; vi. 12.

**13.** Proof that he is not praising himself, but giving his readers material for boasting on his behalf. "For whether we **went** (aorist) beside ourselves, (it was) for God, or **are in our right mind**, (it is) for you." There is a reference to the latter part of v. 11. God knows that one phase of the Apostle's life has been devoted to Him, and his readers know in their consciences that another phase of it has been peculiarly devoted to them. He sums up his whole existence under two forms of manifestation, of which one is what his enemies called his madness, the other what he calls his sober sanity. His madness consisted of his ecstasies, visions, revelations, mystic intercourse with God and Christ, speaking with tongues, and all else of a like nature. His enemies said that His madness commenced with his conversion, being of the opinion of Festus who, when he heard the Apostle narrate that miraculous experience, said, "Paul, thou art beside thyself." It is to his conversion that the historic tense "whether we **went** beside ourselves" refers. That event they considered the parent incident of all the wild aberration, as they deemed it, which followed. When he says that this supernatural and mystic phase of his life was "for God," he means that, when he was in these extraordinary spiritual states or exercising faculties connected with them, he was placed in immediate relation with God, that all was made subservient to God's glory and the spread of the Gospel. How this was the case with regard to prophesying and the gift of tongues may be seen in 1 Cor. xiv. 22, 23, 24. The sober sanity of the Apostle exercised for the good of his readers was his sound judgment, forbearance, care, labour, self-denial, charity, consideration for weakness, prejudice and ignorance, to which all his life and letters bear testimony, and chiefly this very Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It has been rightly remarked (Klöpper), that the ecstatic and the sober-minded regions of his existence were not sundered by hard and fast lines but overlapped each other. How requisite calm reflection and thought were for regulating ecstatic states and turning the results of them to purposes of edification may be seen in 1 Cor. xiv.

The purport of the verse in the context of the argument is that, if this be an exhaustive division of the Apostle's life and these the exclusive objects of each department of it, there is no room amongst his aims for self-praise or any other form of self-seeking, but a sufficient indication is given of the general line of defence which he desires his readers to take up on his behalf and adhere to in detail. He would have them argue against his enemies thus:—'Whatever you may think of Paul, he has but two ends in view. His life is devoted in one aspect of it to God and His glory: in another to us and to our salvation.'

**14.** The reason why his life is dedicated to these ends is that the love of Christ constrains him. Some think that he means *his* love of Christ, just as in v. 11 "the fear of the Lord" is the fear of which the Lord is the object. But the next verse

Digitized by Google

that if one died for all, then were all dead:

15 And *that* he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.

16 Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we *him* no more.

17 Therefore if any man *be* in Christ, [1]*he is* a new creature: [a]old

[1] Or, let him be.
[a] Is. 43. 19. Rev. 21. 5.

clearly points to Christ's love and a decidedly preponderating use of the expression corroborates this sense; cf. Gal. ii. 20. As Christ's death was the result of love to God and love to man combined, the Apostle's twofold devotion corresponds very closely with it. Since Christ's love operates upon those whom it constrains by awakening a loving and active gratitude towards Him, it certainly includes 'love of Christ' as a motive, although that is not the direct sense of the expression of the original. "Constrains us" means confines us within such limits that our course never deviates towards self from its two great objects. The latter part of the verse states the judgment of the Apostle, which, when once formed, caused Christ's love to act upon him in the manner described. The right reading and rendering appear to be:—"**Having come to** (aorist) **this judgment; that one for all died; therefore the all** (for whom the one died) **died.**" This is the first part of the decision at which Paul ultimately arrived in working out, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, his theory of Christ's death. That death for all involved the death of all. The link, which connects with Christ's death the death of all for whom Christ died, is the idea of representation. As "in Adam," their representative, "all died" in one sense, so "in Christ," their representative, "all died" in another and opposite sense. The nature of the death which all died in Christ's death is made clear by Rom. vi. 3, 4, 6, 11, and Gal. v. 4, amongst many other passages. It is a death to the flesh and all its powers whether they rule in the thoughts, feelings, or body. The Apostle says of Christ (Rom. vi. 10):—"in that he died, he died unto sin," and then immediately adds (v. 11):—"likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin." The second part of his judgment refers to the object for which Christ died on behalf of all. As Christ's death had its analogue in the death of men, so had His resurrection its analogue in the new life of men, and that they should lead this new life was the *purpose* of His death.

**16.** The practical consequence of his judgment about Christ's death and its object is:—"*we* from henceforth know no one according to the flesh." The position of "we" in the original shews that it is emphatic. The sense is that, whereas the Apostle and those who think with him know no one according to the flesh, his *opponents do* know some persons so. They valued only what was external, national, legal, and, in one word, according to the flesh, while the Apostle prized only what was according to the Spirit. "But if we **even** (or **actually**) have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now no more do we know Him so." This is taken by some as a statement that St. Paul himself once thought the external elements in Christ's person, life, and work to have an essential value. If this were so, it would indicate a progress in his views and draw a line of demarcation between an earlier and a later stage of his Christology. But the intimations made to him at his conversion (Acts xxvi. 17, 18) would seem to have been sufficient for his full enlightenment. Nor can a *personal* knowledge, of Christ in the flesh by St. Paul, although possible in itself, be what is meant. It remains that he is speaking of his knowledge of Christ previous to his conversion, when he undoubtedly measured him by a carnal standard. His former hatred contrasts with his present love.

**17.** States the consequence, applicable to all believers, which follows from the theory of death with Christ and a new life to Christ, and shows how the Apostle and all that are truly Christ's cease to take carnal views and to measure by carnal standards. "So that if any one is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things **passed** (aorist), behold, **the whole has** become new." According to a reading which has very strong external support, but which is nevertheless not certain, the rendering should be:—'they (the old things) have become new.' 'To be in Christ' is an expression which could not be used of a Christ according to the flesh. A man may profess to belong to such a Christ and to be *of* such a Christ, as the Judaizers at Cornith did, but they cannot be *in* Him, for that phrase expresses a spiritual relation. This relation is realised by all who have died with Christ and been raised with Him. Its realisation begins in baptism. "We were buried with Him through our baptism into His death." As the reality of Christ's death was certified and sealed by His burial, so is the reality of our death with Him certified and sealed

Digitized by Google

things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

18 And all things *are* of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;

19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath [1]committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

[1] Gr. *put in us.*

20 Now then we are ambassadors

---

by baptism received in repentance and faith, in which immersion symbolises burial. The old man dies and is buried, and all his modes of thinking, feeling and acting pass away. This is the negative side of the new creation. But, furthermore, we receive the Holy Spirit in baptism. We are "born of water and the Spirit," and this birth, which is the beginning of our new resurrection-life with Christ (Rom. vi. 4), is symbolised by emersion from the water. Henceforth a man has new motives, aims, principles and standards of action and is, in short, a new creature. St. Paul is still speaking, to a certain extent, ideally, because the old Adam does not die wholly and at once, nor does the new creature come into existence fully grown. But the death and life are both veritable realities, and are ever advancing together to their complete accomplishment. In the description:—"The old state *passed* away, lo, the whole *has become* new," the change of tenses is observable. The entire context has reference to the functions of his own office, *his own* experience, and so represents the perishing of the old in him as a specific event in past time, just as in the next verse he says "who reconciled," while the new nature which succeeded was permanent. But the same language is applicable to every baptized Christian.

**18.** The Judaizers, who had no better knowledge of this creation than Nicodemus, may be conceived asking, in scorn, his question, 'How can these things come to pass?' John iii. 9. The Apostle continues, with a slightly antithetical reference to some such question:—"but **the whole** (i. e. the new creation) is from God." There is but one Creator and He is the author of the spiritual, as he was of the natural creation. The same idea is found in iv. 6. The Apostle states the judicial consequences of this scheme only upon himself, because the same scheme determined also the nature of his Apostolic ministry, which it is one of his main objects to make clear. "From God who **reconciled** us to himself through Jesus Christ and **gave** to us the ministry of reconciliation." This reconciliation effected and offered by God the Apostle had accepted, and had also received at God's hands a ministry of which the function was to proclaim to others in God's name the same reconciliation which he had himself received. As in the last verse the great point was that salvation consists in a man being brought into a state *entirely new*, so in this verse it is that the foundation of that new state is *entirely of God's* laying, and the Apostle was only the instrument which God employed for actually laying this foundation in the hearts of men. The Judaizers persisted in retaining the old which had passed away and they preached a salvation which was not entirely of God's grace but partly by the observances and works of the Law.

**19.** Adds, in a dogmatic form, proof, explanation, and expansion of the statement contained in the last verse. "**Seeing that** (or as is the case because) (**it is**) **God** (who) **was in Christ**, reconciling a world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them (the inhabitants of the world) and having **vested** in us the word of reconciliation." What gave Christ's conciliatory work its entire validity was that God not only originated it (v. 18), but was Himself active in it. It embraced a whole fallen world, not the Jews alone. Two explanatory participial clauses follow, one shewing the manner of God's work in Christ, the other reiterating more expressly than in v. 18, the means appointed by God for the application of the work to the world. The way in which God was reconciling all men to himself in Christ, when He died, is by not imputing their trespasses unto them, Christ's death being the atonement for these trespasses. The phrase "vested in us" is probably borrowed from Ps. civ. 27 (LXX):—'He vested in them (Moses and Aaron) the words of his signs and wonders.' It seems intended to express the personal commission given by God to the Apostle. "The word" of reconciliation is the announcement of reconciliation and of all that man is concerned to know about it, together with exhortation to accept it. The polemical drift is that St. Paul is independent of all human authority and control both with regard to his commission and his preaching (Gal. ii. 6), for he had both directly from God.

**20.** It follows from the first part of the preceding verse ("reconciling *in Christ*") that it was "on Christ's behalf" that he was acting, i.e. in order that Christ might not fail to attain the object of his work; and

Digitized by Google

for Christ, as though God did beseech *you* by us: we pray *you* in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

21 For he hath made him *to be* sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

---

from the last part ("vested in us the word of reconciliation") that his mission was that of an ambassador, and again from the first part ("*God* reconciling") that in his ambassadorial capacity he represented God. The passive form "**become** reconciled" is undoubtedly used to indicate that men are more acted upon than agents. God is the author and giver of the reconciliation, men are the recipients.

**21.** Shews how strong an inducement to comply with his prayer he is empowered to hold out in his preaching, on account of the manner in which God's love and mercy established reconciliation. The important statement is more emphatic without 'for,' which has no right in the text. "**Him who came to no acquaintance with** sin, on **our behalf** He **made** (to be) sin, in order that we should become the righteousness of God in Him." "**Came to** no acquaintance with sin" can only refer to Christ's life in the flesh from his conception by the Virgin Mary until God made Him to be sin. The subjective negative of the original for "*no* acquaintance" indicates that Christ's sinlessness was the qualification which fitted Him in God's eyes to be the agent of reconciliation. Him, the sinless, God identified with sin—all sin that ever has been or will be committed by man, gathered up, as it were, into one total, God imposed upon Him the guilt of all this, regarded and treated Him as guilty of it all. Christ took it on Himself in a most real sense, and felt all the horror of it. This He did "on our behalf," for the object was "that we should become the righteousness of God in Him," Christ. That is, that God might regard and treat us as though we were righteous, having a righteousness, not of our own, nor of the works of the law, but yet a most real righteousness of which God is the author and giver. The idea involved in the words "in Him" is that of representation, as in v. 14, "if one for all died, therefore all died." The abstract terms "sin" and "righteousness" signify that there is no sin whatsoever of which Christ did not bear the guilt, nor any element of righteousness which believers do not obtain from God in Christ. "Made (to be) sin" refers to a specific act on God's part, and there are only two passages in the Lord's life to which this act of making Him sin can be referred. One is His Agony in Gethsemane and the other His death. The context of this chapter seems to point to the latter (v. 15), but it is not an unfounded opinion that our Lord's Passion, properly so called, which extended from Gethsemane to Calvary, consisted of distinct stages, not only with regard to His sufferings, which is obvious, but with regard to the divine work which His sufferings were accomplishing. But the work was completed only by His death.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on ver. 3.

**3.** The only difficulty in interpretation given is that the words rendered "**when we do put on**" should according to more ordinary usage be rendered 'when we have put on,' that is, should denote an act antecedent to the finding and not simultaneous with it, the tense being an aorist and not a present. But it is certain that an aorist participle very frequently expresses an act not prior to, but contemporary with, that of the finite verb which accompanies it. Moreover, a perfect participle (ἐνδεδυμένοι) could not have been used, because it would signify a completed act and a consequent state existing before the finding, which would yield no sense. Neither could an imperfect participle (ἐνδυόμενοι) have been employed, because it would express an act in course of performance and not complete, whereas the change will take place in a moment, 'in the twinkling of an eye,' and to such a case the aorist, the tense of momentary occurrence, is precisely suitable. The above very simple interpretation of this vexed verse is that of Professor Evans, who suggested and defended it in the Journ. of Classical and Sacred Philology. (No. ix. 1858). If εἴπερ is to be read instead of εἴ γε, it points more precisely the supposition under which the putting on of the new body will be a super-investiture.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER VI.

*1 That he hath approved himself a faithful minister of Christ, both by his exhortations, 3 and by integrity of life, 4 and by patient enduring all kinds of affliction and disgraces for the gospel. 10 Of which he speaketh the more boldly amongst them, because his heart is open to them, 13 and he expecteth the like affection from them again, 14 exhorting to flee the society and pollutions of idolaters, as being themselves temples of the living God.*

WE then, *as* workers together *with him*, beseech *you* also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.

---

CHAP. VI. Having completed his defence to the better-disposed Jewish, St. Paul turns to the better-disposed heathen believers. The change of the persons addressed is sufficiently indicated by the citation of a notable prophecy referring to the Gentiles, and by the specific contents of the warning administered (vi. 14—vii. 1). The danger which threatened was a relapse into pagan immorality and into that form of it for which Corinth was notorious. These erring brethren murmured at the abstinence which Christianity imposed upon them. They made the Lord's Supper a scene of intemperance. They defended fornication and partaking of idol-feasts, as things allowed by Christian liberty, and there was a general reluctance amongst them to discontinue the characteristic vices of heathenism. See 1 Cor. v. 1, 9, 12–20; vi. 9, 10, 11; viii. x., xi. 21. They are not to be confounded with the extreme heathen section addressed at the end of the Epistle, but the warnings of the First Epistle had failed to take effect upon them, and it would have been impossible to restore a right understanding without giving them a strict admonition. The drift of the appeal, which extends from vi. 1 to vii. 1, is made more clear by bearing in mind the following points:

1. To this party belonged those who tolerated the flagrant offender of 1 Cor. v. and who felt themselves indirectly condemned by the Apostle's judgment upon him. This throws light upon the list of qualities (vi. 3–10) by which he had commended himself. The case of the immoral person is kept in view throughout.

2. It was this party which had scandalised the Jewish believers and brought upon St. Paul's teaching and ministry the reproach that it allowed gross immorality. Although the persons so deeply affected by his last letter (vii. 10, 11) seem to have been of this class, and there was thus a decided promise of improvement, yet it was absolutely necessary to remind them that their practices were a stain upon the Gospel and imperilled their salvation, to show that the peculiar calumny which they had occasioned was unfounded, and to wrest from the Judaizers all pretext for saying that *they* were the sole guardians of pure morals, and so claiming the right of discipline over the heathen converts.

The section consists of:

i. A brief introductory summary of his exhortation with the ground upon which it is based, vi. 1, 2.

ii. A description of his ministerial conduct and experience, the object of which is to shew that he is a fit person to give his converts practical warnings and that he can be actuated by no other motive than love, vi. 3–10.

iii. The details of the warning, vi. 11—vii. 1.

1. As God's *ambassador* his exhortation is "become reconciled" (v. 20), "but" on another side of his ministry, which has to do with the effective appropriation of God's offer of grace, he is a *co-operator* with God, and in this capacity he has also an exhortation to give. "**But co-operating we also exhort** that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." There is an emphasis on the "ye" from its position at the end of the clause in the original. It seems as if St. Paul had in his mind some others who *had* received the grace of God in vain, and these may have been either the Israelites referred to in the prophecy quoted in the next verse or the Judaizers. So far as these latter insisted upon the works of the law they did nullify God's grace (Gal. iii. 2, 3). Some, restricting the grace to the offer of reconciliation, which, as made to Gentiles, who are not the primary heirs of the promises, is peculiarly a *grace*, would render: "that ye may not *have accepted* the grace of God in vain," that is, that their subsequent conduct should not be such as to make void their previous reconciliation, which would be questionable Greek (Madvig, Gr. Synt. § 172; Winer, § 44, pp. 297–299, 6th ed.). There is no reason why the grace should not comprise the grace of God's spirit working in men after reconciliation and enabling them to fulfil all that was implied in their acceptance of reconciliation through Christ's death (v. 14, 15), viz. the mortification and crucifixion of the flesh. It was exactly this that the heathen Christians were not practising. This extended sense of grace also gives a more pointed meaning to the Apostle's co-operation with God. God worked by inward grace, the Apostle by outward exhortation. That God is the person with whom he co-operates appears

Digitized by Google

b Is. 49. 8.

2 (For he saith, [b]I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now *is* the accepted time; behold, now *is* the day of salvation.)

3 Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed:

4 But in all *things* [1]approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses,

5 In stripes, in imprisonments, [1]in

1 Gr. *commending*.

1 Or, *in tossings to and fro.*

---

from the context (v. 18–21). Compare 1 Cor. iii. 9. The Apostle certainly was, as a matter of fact, a fellow-worker also with his converts, but that is not the point here.

**2.** A statement of God Himself is adduced in support of the exhortation. God declares that he offers His grace to the heathen nations, amongst whom were the Corinthians, with a definite opportunity of accepting it. If the opportunity is allowed to slip, it will be lost. In the passage cited, Isaiah xliv. 8, the Messiah, "the servant of God," complains of Israel, "I have laboured *in vain* (κενῶς, LXX); I have spent my strength for nought and *in vain*," which expressions suggested the Apostle's "in vain". here. The Lord answered: "Though Israel be not gathered . . . I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles . . . thus saith the Lord," still addressing the Messiah, His servant, "in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I succoured thee." This hearing and this succour, as the context of the prophecy implies, were to be realised in the bringing over of the Gentiles to Christ's cause. The grace of God therefore offered to the Corinthians was a part of the hearing and the succour *rendered to the Messiah*. This shews in what sense St. Paul applies to the heathen believers what was originally addressed to the Saviour. It is in the very nature of "a time" and "a day" that they are fugitive and pass away. It is now or never.

We might at this point have expected to hear at once *how* the heathen converts were in danger of losing their opportunity, and to have the substance of the exhortation which they needed. Instead of this, the Apostle breaks off and states in detail in what ways he had as a minister of God endeavoured to commend himself. He is going to touch upon the most delicate point between himself and the community, where the slightest friction might set up a new irritation. He therefore treads warily and paves a way through their affections for his admonition. He seems to feel sure, after the effect of his last letter, (ch. vii.) that what he here says of himself will not be doubted, and he probably wished it to secure a warmer reception for the reconciliation between him and them which he is going to announce in vii. 16.

**3.** The line of conduct which he pursues as suitable to one who has exhortations to deliver in co-operating with God. The construction takes up that of co-operating in ver. 1. The subjective Greek negatives imply that he *regards* the conduct mentioned as essential for the efficacy of admonitions and reproofs. The original does not mean that he succeeds in giving no offence, but only that he tries to give none. The gravest anxiety of a minister of the Gospel must always be the apprehension that, through his fault and the blame thereby incurred, the cause of God, whom he represents, and the work of Christ should be hindered.

**4.** "But," on the contrary, as a minister of God, he strove to commend himself in everything, which does not mean that he endeavoured to be highly thought of in his sacred office, but that his holding this office was the reason why he tried to commend himself and was one of the regulating principles of his ministerial work. Many things which he had done or left undone with regard to the Corinthians would, if measured by this standard, have brought him approval instead of giving offence. The first particular of his self-commendation is much stedfast **endurance**. The original, inadequately rendered by 'patience' (A.V.), denotes a masculine constancy in holding out under trials. This grace is exhibited in the things which he had to *bear* and of these there are three classes, each containing three members (*vv.* 4, 5).

i. Difficulties which hindered his activity. 1. Afflicting straits. 2. Necessities. 3. Difficulties which so pen him in that he is powerless. In the first of these he is like a man crushed by a multitude, unable to move according to his will. Compare Mark iii. 9 and Matt. vii. 14, "the straitened way." By the second are meant situations in which he is opposed by a force which no effort of his can overcome. The original term is used by the Greek poets for irresistible fate, and is the "dira necessitas" of the Romans, Hor. Od. I. xxxv. It is derived from a word which denotes the compression of strangulation. The third are positions in which he is jammed into a corner and cannot move to right or left. Ample illustrations suggest themselves in the known events of his life.

Digitized by Google

tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings;

6 By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned,

7 By the word of truth, by the

---

5. ii. Hardships inflicted upon him by men. 1. Blows, scourging by rod or lash inflicted by Roman or Jewish police (cf. xii. 24). 2. Imprisonments, less painful to the body, but to a man with a mission and a spirit like those of St. Paul, more trying. 3. Tumults, Acts xiv. 5, 19; xix. 24. They probably stand last, partly because they were attended with peril of life and were often designed to destroy him, and partly because they were the occasion of a peculiar injustice, for the first Christian missionaries were usually accused of raising them and had to bear the infamy and the punishment. iii. Hardships inseparable from his missionary work. 1. Labours; described by a word which denotes their wasting and disabling effects. 2. Watchings. Frequent foregoing of sleep from protracting his work into the night (Acts xx. 7, 31) or from other causes. 3. Fastings. Forced abstinence from food. The context shews that he is not referring to voluntary fasting, as a spiritual discipline, though he practised this. Acts xiv. 23; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 37.

6, 7. After his constant endurance, other graces and qualities which had characterised his ministerial life are enumerated in five pairs. 1. *Chastity* and knowledge. Next to his mastery over hunger comes very naturally his mastery over another appetite and the more obviously suitable the mention of this was with reference to heathen and especially Corinthian licentiousness, the more unnecessary it is to give the original word any other than its proper sense of chastity. There is nowhere any trace of an imputation against St. Paul, even from his worst enemies on this score. The sense of "knowledge" is determined by its pointed juxtaposition with chastity. Some pretenders to philosophic enlightenment and a true perception of what constituted moral purity and defilement used their imagined knowledge for setting aside all restraints of moral law. How they argued with regard to idol-meats appears in 1 Cor. viii. 1, compared with 1 Cor. vi. 13, and they no doubt applied a like argument to the sexes. By mentioning his knowledge he reminds them that he had exhibited no unenlightened bigotry with regard to legal cleanness and uncleanness, and so the warning which he is going to deliver cannot be attributed to ignorance or narrow views of true moral distinctions. Knowledge in his case goes hand in hand with chastity and with the requirement of it from others as strictly incumbent upon all believers. So baseless was the calumny that his doctrine produced immorality and that he winked at it. 2. The two last graces, which appertained mainly to his conduct in God's sight, are followed by two exhibited in his conduct to men, longsuffering and kindness. Both are forms of that charity (1 Cor. xiii. 4) which as he urges so strongly (1 Cor. viii. 1) should attend upon knowledge. Another connecting link probably is that the pure are often intolerant of the impure and those who have not abused knowledge of those that have. Not so St. Paul. He had been accused both of hastiness and harshness in the case of the great transgressor, yet all the facts show that he had endured long and been very gentle with regard to the sin of which that person's conduct had only been one marked example, as well as with regard to the person himself (1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 10, 11; vii. 2, 3. See 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Cor. i. 23; ii. 5–11). 3. That the two next graces form a pair is more apparent in the original than in the A. V., and is shewn by each having an epithet, "holy" and "unfeigned." The relation between the spirit and love is stated in Gal. v. 22: "The fruit of the spirit is love." The Apostle had commended himself by both in his general ministry; but the specific point is that, being guided by the *holy* Spirit, he must condemn the opposite of holiness, heathen immorality, yet he does it with genuine and not with simulated love. The term "unfeigned" plainly points to the charge that in his discipline he forgot the charity he professed so often. It was probably said that his panegyric of the cardinal grace (1 Cor. xiii.) was itself but the tinkling of a cymbal and mere hypocrisy. 4. From the spirit and love in the *heart* the advance to *word* and *deed* is natural. "The word of truth" includes both his preaching and his communications in ordinary intercourse, for he had been accused of falsehood with regard to both. The "power of God" (iv. 7) comprises the whole of his ministerial activity but the context must determine what manifestation of this power is particularly meant and it points to his disciplinary courage and firmness. It might have seemed ungracious to allude to this here, had he not been charged with weakness on one side and severity on the other. He claimed no power of his own, for it was God's, but as he had exercised it decisively in one case (1 Cor. v. 4), he might use it so again, if his warnings were neglected. At

Digitized by Google

power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left,

8 By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and *yet* true;

9 As unknown, and *yet* well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed;

10 As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and *yet* possessing all things.

11 O *ye* Corinthians, our mouth

---

the same time he could not exercise God's power to wrong, to destroy or to serve grasping purposes (vii. 2), as his adversaries employed *their* power. Rom. i. 16 furnishes no ground for restricting the expression to his power in preaching. The context requires a more special reference. 5. The power of God suggests the weapons by which it is exerted. They are the weapons of righteousness, nor could God's power be put forth by any other. The general idea is best explained by 2 Cor. x. 3, 4. "Powerful for God" there, corresponds with "power of God" here, and "carnal weapons" there are the opposite of "weapons of righteousness" here. A comparison of the passages indicates that he means weapons of integrity which smite with perfect impartiality, undirected and unhindered by fear or favour or any regard for self. "**The right-hand and left-hand weapons**" may either signify a perfect accoutrement, or defensive weapons like the shield on the left, and offensive like the sword on the right. In favour of the first notion is the fact that the expression is not, 'the right-hand and *the* left-hand weapons' which would give an express specification to each, but "the right-hand and left-hand weapons" which describes them more collectively. According to the second, the sense is that he is no more afraid, as was falsely said, to assail with his right hand pagan corruption than he was to pull down Judaizing strongholds (2 Cor. x. 4), and that he was equally ready to parry with his left by all righteous means in his power every blow aimed at him in his office or person. This interpretation yields the completest sense. In any case the weapons of righteousness are a contrast to the unrighteous and carnal warfare of his enemies.

**8, 9, 10.** A series of contrasted situations through which he is continually passing and most, if not all of which he had just experienced in the recent crisis of the Corinthian church. They run in nine combinations, or rather in four pairs of combinations; in the fourth of which the last combination is twofold. 1. "**Through glory** and dishonour, through evil report and good report." Glory and dishonour may befall a man either in his presence or his absence, either in word or deed, either together or in succession. For an example of glory see Gal. iv. 14, and for a summary of dishonour, 1 Cor. iv. 11–13. In Corinth St. Paul had first honour, then dishonour, and at the time of writing a mixture of both. Evil report and good report are generally awarded in a man's absence, and are glory and dishonour expressed in words. The A. V. is not quite correct in rendering '*by* honour;' for the preposition of the original does not mean that the honour and the dishonour, as such, are the *means* by which he commends himself. To make out this sense it would be necessary to import the idea that the honour comes from the friends and the dishonour from the foes of the Gospel. He is only describing phases of his life, in passing through which he commends himself. 2. The second pair of combinations illustrates the evil report and good report respectively: "as misleaders and true; as failing to find recognition and finding true recognition." The misleading expresses the opinion which the Judaizers held of his preaching, and a very forcible illustration of it is found in the Clementine Homilies xvii. 19. The original term is a contumelious one, denoting a compound of the vagrant and the cheat. As he had been thought dishonest in his ordinary statements, there is no need to exclude an allusion to this, and "true" repels both this imputation and the other against his preaching. "Failing to find recognition and finding true recognition" is rather a paraphrase than a translation of the original, but gives the right drift, which is that, whether from the incapacity, indifference, or hostility of others, he ever and anon fails to be known, and, again, finds himself ever and anon well known in his real character. This happened to him continually, but he is probably thinking of his late experience in Corinth. At first he was well known there; then set in a current of misrepresentation, now the tide had again turned. His right aspect, clouded for a season, was once more coming into light. Neither 'unknown' nor 'ignored' gives the force of the original, which also precludes the idea that he is speaking of his obscure antecedents and, as a matter of fact, he was no obscure personage. 3. That the next two combinations go together is shown by the mention of death in both. The connection with the

Digitized by Google

is open unto you, our heart is enlarged.

12 Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels.

13 Now for a recompence in the same, (I speak as unto *my* children,) be ye also enlarged.

14 Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what

---

preceding perhaps is that the dying and the chastisement result from failing to be known, which caused rejection and persecution. The dying and living are explained by iv. 10. It was a continual dying replaced continually by a sudden ("behold") reviving, which is not a mere respite or prolongation of a miserable existence, but a repeated resuscitation by Christ's life, restoring him to activity, hope, and joy, as if he had never been on the verge of death. He is alluding in part to what he said in i. 8, 9, 10. "Receiving chastisement and not suffering death" is an application of Ps. cxviii. 18, "The Lord hath chastened me, but not given me over unto death." He does not, in the least, exempt himself from the general law of being schooled by sufferings (πάθει μάθος, Aesch. Agam. 177). He grants that his sufferings are God's discipline, and expressly states this with regard to one of the severest of them, his "stake for the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7), only he must add the fact that God never allows them to advance to the extremity of death. 4. Not only does he suffer, but he feels his sufferings: "as grieving yet always rejoicing, as poor yet making many rich." External sufferings never caused him grief (Rom. v. 3, ff.), but he sorrowed when his work did not prosper, when he saw his converts relapsing into sin, giving ear to seducing teachers, listening to calumnies against himself, disobeying his authority, slighting his affection. His readers would well understand all this (i. 4–10; ii. 4). Yet God continually removes these causes of his grief and substitutes for it joy. Exactly so had matters gone in Corinth (vii. 9), but similar things had no doubt occurred in other cases, and the words admit of a more general application. The transition from grief to poverty, from the pain of the heart to its wants, is natural. The original term does not denote a person in circumstances of poverty merely, and the word which does express that idea (πένης) occurs but once in the New Testament (2 Cor. ix. 9), and that in a citation from the Old. The term before us designates one who feels his poverty. It may certainly refer to the Apostle's outward circumstances (1 Cor. iv. 11; Phil. iv. 12), but must mean also in a higher sense that he is, of himself, nothing, and is conscious of his nothingness (2 Cor. viii. 9). Yet he makes many rich by dispensing to them out of his earthen vessel the true and incorruptible riches. Earthly poverty comes out more clearly in the next antithesis: "as having nothing yet **keeping**" or "**holding fast**" or "retaining all things." He had surrendered all worldly goods and interests for the gospel, yet even here not worldly things alone are meant, for he had dedicated his body and all the great natural powers of his soul (ψυχή) to the same cause. Still he was sensible that in this he had lost nothing, but had secured the permanent possession of all things. He experienced the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise given in Mark x. 28–30, and the greater promise: "whosoever will lose his life (soul) for my sake shall find it" (Matt. xvi. 25).

11. He adds the last touches to the preface of his warning in vv. 11, 12, 13, still appealing to their affections. The current of his joy at the changed situation in Corinth had swept away all the barriers to free speech. So he exclaims:—"our mouth is open . . . ." He remembers how he had to speak in his last letter decisively, shortly and, as it were, with compressed lips, and he now experiences an irrepressible sense of relief. His open lips are but the outward sign of his expanded heart. That also had been contracted, and the space which the Corinthians had occupied in it been narrowed. Now the chambers were widened again.

12. The scanty room was not in him, but in the seat of their own affections, and it hampered *his* free admission to *their* hearts. Even now the feeling in Corinth towards him was not all that he could desire.

13. "**But as a requital, the same** (in kind and degree), I speak as to children, be ye also **widened**." He claims, instead of their present narrow-heartedness, a reciprocation on their part of *his* capacious love for them. They should repay in the same kind and to the same extent as they received. They should lay aside all suspicions and sinister impressions which calumny had infused into them and grant their spiritual father and his warning free access to the hearts of his children. Assuming that his request is granted, he proceeds after this noble preface to deliver in detail (vi. 13–vii. 1) the admonition which he couched in general terms at vi. 1, 2.

14. "Do not **become incongruously**

Digitized by Google

fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

15 And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

16 And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye

---

yoked to unbelievers." A rather stricter rendering would be "**heterogeneously yoked.**" The allusion is to Lev. xix. 19: "Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind," where the LXX use a word of which St. Paul's is a derivative, whence it is clear that this was the passage in his mind. Different yokes are adapted to different species of animals, so a creature of a different species from another is called a creature of a different yoke. The life of the heathen is regarded here as a yoke. Compare Gal. iv. 8, 9. The same figure is applied to believers in Rom. vi. 18, 19, and is aptly illustrated by Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. i. 16, where Christians are called those who had "come under the yoke of righteousness," an expression partly fashioned after St. Paul and partly after that of the Saviour "my yoke is easy." Nothing could be more diverse than the yokes of the believer and the heathen. So those who bear them are beings of a different race and species. Believers are a spiritual, pagans a natural generation. In the pagan the old man prevails, while believers are a new creation. These two races cannot be mingled, as they would be by making common cause in life and habits. The specific form of the original prohibition might seem to imply that the Apostle is forbidding only mixed marriages or other mixed consorting of the sexes; some would restrict the reference to participation at idol feasts. That no such limitation is intended seems clear from what immediately follows up to ver. 17 and from 1 Cor. x. 7 ff. How pervading a principle of the Mosaic Law purity was may be seen by a comparison of Lev. xix. 19 with Deut. xxii. 10, where the prohibition is extended: "Thou shalt not plough with an ox and ass together." In both passages it is forbidden to wear raiment of linen and wool mixed, and to sow a field with "divers seeds, and the reason assigned is "lest the fruit of the seed . . . be defiled." The fundamental idea is that everything has been created by God "after its kind," that everything is to be allowed to retain unadulterated the qualities which belong to its kind, and that there is impurity in mixing them. The Apostle proceeds to enforce the prohibition by five rapid questions pointing out the essential opposition existing between the two yokes.

1. In the moral and spiritual states which they respectively represent. The righteousness meant is not imputed, but realised in practice, i.e. holiness (Rom. vi. 19), just as the lawlessness was that which was actually practised by the heathen. How far the Corinthian believers had, in fact, attained to holiness no more comes into account than the question how far those were, in fact, saints whom he habitually calls so. Rom. i. 7; 2 Cor. i. 1, &c. &c.

2. In the elements to which these two states respectively belong. The element of the one is light, that of the other darkness, and these exclude each other in the spiritual as in the natural world.

**15.** 3. In the heads of the two kingdoms, Christ and Beliar. Beliar, the later Syrian and Greek form of Belial, means 'worthlessness,' 'depravity,' and represents the Prince of Darkness, as the chief of unclean spirits and the impersonation of impurity. The reference to Corinthian sensuality and the antithesis to Christ, the anointed "with the spirit of holiness" (Rom. i. 4), are equally pointed. St. Paul considered heathendom to be under the rulers of the darkness of this world. Between them and Christ there is no **harmony** but absolute discord.

4. In the difference of the bonds which unite these rival powers and their subjects. The bond between Christ and His followers is faith, a compound of belief and trust. The bond between Beliar and his slaves is unbelief. Satan and his angels indeed are not deceived, for they believe and tremble, but they deceive men and league them in a confederacy of disbelief and defiance. The original for "portion" means a portion of meat, a political party, a class of citizens, a portion in an inheritance (Col. i. 12). Any one of these meanings gives an apt interpretation; but whichever is taken, a joint portion can only express a general assimilation of life, and cannot be restricted to any one thing, such as partaking at idol feasts. Two societies with opposite organic principles cannot make common cause in life and conduct.

**16.** 5. In the contradiction which would be involved in any concordat between the Church of God and the objects of heathen adoration. The Apostle has not used a compendious expression for "what covenant has the sanctuary of God with *that of* idols." The sanctuary of God is the community of believers, and these are forbidden, exactly as in Exod. xxiii. 33, which passage St. Paul clearly had in his mind, to make covenant,

Digitized by Google

are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, [c]I will dwell in them, and walk in *them;* and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

[c] Lev. 26. 12.

17 [d]Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing;* and I will receive you,

[d] Is. 52. 11.

18 [e]And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

[e] Jer. 31. 1.

---

not with the *temple of idols*, but with the heathen or "with their Gods." The usual application is that, as the Temple suffered desecration by the introduction of idols, which happened more than once in Jewish history, so the Church of Christ would be profaned by adopting a manner of life which brought it into contact with idols and idol worship.

Individuals are also sanctuaries of God, and may profane themselves by making covenant with idols (Ezek. xiv. 3) but the context shews that St. Paul is speaking collectively. As it is the crowning glory of the Church that it is God's sanctuary, he dwells upon the idea. He justifies his application of it to believers as a body by reiterating it in a stronger form: "for **we** (ἡμεῖς) are the **sanctuary** of the *living* God." The epithet contrasts God with *dead* idols, suggests the spiritual death to which the daemons represented by idols must bring them, and reminds them of the spirit of holiness through which the *living* God dwells in them (iii. 3), which is the agent of their new creation of life, and at enmity with all heathen impurity. He supports his application by citing Lev. xxvi. 11, 12 with the omission of a clause, and the substitution of *their* for *your*, possibly caused by Ezek. xxxvii. 27. The second clause may have been omitted because the Apostle quoted from memory, and possibly a reminiscence of Ez. xxxvii. 27 caused the substitution of *their* for *your* in the last. "I will set my tabernacle among you, and my soul shall not abhor you, and I will walk among you and be your God and ye shall be my people." Lev. xxvi., being a constituent part of God's original covenant with his people was exactly suited to the Apostle's purpose. It commences by prohibiting idols, which is the point in question here; and compliance with this prohibition was a condition of God's dwelling in Israel. The allusion is to Jehovah's presence and the visible token of it in the tabernacle, and 'I will walk among you' refers to the travelling of that provisional sanctuary during the wanderings of the Israelites. "God became a pilgrim amidst his pilgrim people." He dwelt among them equally when the temple became His fixed habitation. The emphasis upon "**we**" seems to contrast the spiritual and personal sanctuary of the Church with the material sanctuary of the tabernacle. Under the new covenant God dwells not *amongst* men *merely*, but **in** them. See note at end of chapter.

**17.** The obligation imposed by the fulfilment of this promise is expressed in the charge delivered to the chosen nation through Isaiah, when God was about to bring it back to its own land from the Babylonish captivity and renew His dwelling in the midst of it. (Isaiah lii. 11.) "Depart ye, depart ye. go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye out of the midst of her; be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." The Apostle quotes the LXX. from memory, which accounts for the modifications. The double "depart" urges promptitude, as if the people had become attached to the land of their servitude, and is appropriate to a voluntary separation of Christians from pagan pollutions. The verse following that cited assigns as a reason for purifying themselves the close proximity to God into which they were to come in their exodus:—"for the Lord will go before you and the God of Israel shall be your rereward," which being in fact a walking of God with his people, is also very appropriate. The prophet addresses the priests and Levites, as bearers of the sacred vessels of the sanctuary and of the worship, now to be restored, and possibly the idea at the root of the application is that believers constitute a priestly community, which is no less a Pauline than a Petrine view; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9 "a royal priesthood." '*And I will receive you*' (A. V.), which should be "and I will **welcome you in**," represents the marginal rendering in the A. V. of the last words of Isaiah lii. 12: "The God of Israel will gather you up" (ὁ ἐπισυνάγων ὑμᾶς, LXX.), which expresses the collecting of the nation, after their march, into one body with a view to their re-entering the Holy Land. It may however have been suggested by a reminiscence of Ezek. xx. 34. (LXX.) or of Zeph. iii. 20, where the same word (εἰσδέξομαι) is used for the same thing. In St. Paul's quotation the antithesis between, "come out," and "I will welcome you in," is obvious. That into which God will welcome those who come out is what the land of Canaan symbolises in the prophetic passages, and the next verse suggests that St.

Digitized by Google

Paul had in his mind the idea of the family and household of God.

**18.** The blessings consequent upon this welcome are the privileges of adopted sons and daughters of God. When the titles, Father and Son, designate the relation between God and His people in the O. T., they signify only paternal affections and treatment on one side, and filial feelings and conduct on the other, that is, a sonship by adoption. So St. Paul says of the Jews: "to whom pertaineth the adoption" (Rom. ix. 4). Under the new covenant a higher sonship is accessible, also by adoption, not by generation. The condition of it is faith (Gal. iii. 26) in Christ. But to as many as receive Christ by faith and so become sons (*υἱοί*) of God, Christ grants the privilege of becoming also children (*τέκνα*) of God, that is, sons by generation, by a new birth which is of God (John i. 12), through the Spirit, and is *regeneration*. With this new birth begins the holy life of a new creature, and it is only by perseverance in this life of holiness that the position and blessings of adoption can be maintained. It is precisely this that the Apostle is urging upon his readers. The language is culled from different passages of the O. T. See 2 Sam. vii. a Messianic Passage concerning the temple and the throne of David, in v. 8 of which the LXX. insert "saith the Lord Almighty," and in v. 14 occur the words, "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." See Jer. xxxvi. 9. The word of *the Almighty* is a guarantee that his promise will be fulfilled. St. Paul expressly makes the paternal relationship of God to include women as well as men. "Ye shall be to me for sons and daughters." See Isaiah xliii. 6. It is characteristic of Christianity that it was the first system that ever recognised the dignity of women and raised them generally to the same moral and spiritual level with men. It was very suitable to the Apostle's admonition to notice the unhappy women at Corinth, where above all places in the world they were lured to ruin by organised immoralities under the cloak of religion.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on ver. 16.

### God Dwelling with Men.

**16.** It is only possible here to give a few references and combinations upon this important truth. Its beginnings, under the Jewish dispensation, are found in the cloud and the fiery pillar; then in the Shechinah in Tabernacle and Temple: then in prophecy, Ps. cxviii. 22, Is. xxviii. 1; and Ezek. xxvii. 21–28 intimates that its fuller realisation was reserved for the time of the Messiah, while Joel ii. 28, 29 foretells the mode of its accomplishment. Compare Mal. iii. 1 with John i. 11 and see Godet and Westcott on the application, of temple (*ναός*) in Mal. iii. 1 to the Jewish nation. Many think, with Chrysostom, that Is. vii. 14 announces the Godhead of the Messiah. If so, the title Immanuel (Matt. i. 23) was primarily fulfilled in the Incarnation, and the flesh (John i. 14) was the tabernacle of Godhead. Compare John ii. 19–22, and see Godet there and on John i. 14. In Matt. xxi. 42 and the parallels the Saviour applies Ps. cxviii. 22 to himself: comp. Matt. xvi. 8. Next, see Christ's sayings in John xiv. 15–24, xxii. 23, and with them comp. Luke xvii. 20, 21. Apostolic expansions are found in 1 Pet. ii. 4–7, iv. 17. Rom. viii. 10; 1 Cor. iii. 9, 10, 16, 17, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 19–22, &c. &c. Rev. xxi. shows figuratively in what more complete manner still, on the final estabiishment of Christ's Kingdom, "the tabernacle of God is with men and he will dwell with them." Rev. xxi. 3.

The divers ways in which God has dwelt with men are so many successive stages in the perfect accomplishment of man's salvation, and may be thus briefly summed up. 1. He dwelt amongst men through the visible signs of his power and presence under the old Dispensation. 2. In human nature through the Incarnation. 3. The incarnate son of God pitched his tent or encamped amongst men. He occupied, so to speak, "amongst members of the same caravan, a tent like theirs (*ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*)." 4. Since his glorification, the Father and He have dwelt in believers through the Holy Spirit and in two ways:—a. In the Church as a body which is the living temple of God. b. In believers individually, who are living stones in God's temple, sons and daughters of God by spiritual regeneration. The consummation will be the entire pervasion of the human by the divine nature.

---

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER VII.

*1 He proceedeth in exhorting them to purity of life, 2 and to bear him like affection as he doth to them. 3 Whereof lest he might seem to doubt, he declareth what comfort he took in his afflictions, by the report which Titus gave of their godly sorrow, which his former epistle had wrought in them, 13 and of their lovingkindness and obedience towards Titus, answerable to his former boastings of them.*

HAVING therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.

2 Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man.

---

CHAP. VII. 1. The sum and substance of the exhortation in the form of a conclusion from the promises. "**These then being the promises that we have**" marks the promises as unique in character and strong in motive power. Believers have them not merely as pledges of future benefits, but in part already realised. Still they may be forfeited by unholiness, which disqualifies men from being members of a holy God's family, and unfits the community or the heart of the individual from being His habitation, Rev. xxi. 27. His inclusion of himself among the exhorted, and the title "beloved," shew that he is not a harsh spiritual dictator, and that, whatever their conduct may have been, it has not altered His affection for them. Defilement of the flesh refers to all sensual sins, such as drunkenness and gluttony (Cor. v. 11, vi. 10, xi. 7, 21), but especially to licentiousness in all its forms (1 Cor. v. 9, 16; vi. 5–20). The objection that St. Paul views the flesh itself as the source of pollution, and cannot regard it as *contracting* pollution, is untenable. In Adam the flesh was for a while pure, and in Christ it never ceased to be so. In those who have died with Christ the flesh is *ideally* dead, and its *actual* cleansing begins with the reception of the spirit. But it lusts against the spirit, is always liable to defilement, and always needs further purification. The exact sense of "defilement of spirit" is not so clear, but it seems most probable that St. Paul here designates as spirit our highest faculties spiritualised. One fair illustration of defilement of spirit, which, however, may occur in manifold forms, is furnished by 1 Cor. viii. 7. With negative cleansing, is to go on the positive process of "perfecting holiness." The original for "perfecting" is used in Gal. iii. 3, Phil. i. 6, in contradistinction to the initiatory stages of Christian progress and work. It is a hieratic word, used in classic Greek for the due performance of sacrifice and other religious rites, and so expresses aptly the full accomplishment of the *sacred* work of sanctification. The completeness does not consist in its being a sanctification *both* of the flesh and of the spirit, but in the perfection of the holiness itself. Still it can only mean a relative holiness, because absolute sanctity is unattainable in this world. Holiness of the flesh would exist, if all its principles were only instruments of righteousness, as in Christ, and holiness of spirit, if conscience were free from all sense of sin committed, and its cognate faculties were spiritualised into the very highest form of their activity. But sharp lines cannot be drawn between holiness of spirit and holiness of flesh, nor between the defilement of each, because they act and react upon each other. The atmosphere in which holiness moves on to perfection is the fear of God. This motive power belongs mainly to the old dispensation and to the earlier stages of the Christian course. It was most applicable to the Corinthians, and, so long as man is liable to sin, cannot be dispensed with.

**2–4.** The link of connection between his warning and the resumption of the subject which he commenced in ii. 12, abruptly broke off at ii. 17.

**2.** "**Make room for us**" reverts to the 'be ye widened' in vi. 13, so that the first word of the epilogue to the warning corresponds with the last of the prologue. When a father speaks to children, he and his words deserve admission to their heart. But he adds three specific reasons why he should have it, and in his earnestness, omits all connecting particles. "**No one did we wrong: no one did we ruin: no one did we overreach.**" That the person alluded to is the flagrant offender is proved by ii. 5–13. He is on the point of taking up again (v. 5) the trouble mentioned in ii. 13 ff., and the preceding verses there (5–12) all allude to that person's case out of which the trouble arose. Similarly here the case is referred to just before a recurrence to the same trouble. These allusions are also exactly in their proper place, because the offender belonged to the very class which is addressed in vi. 14—vii. 1, and in order that the present warning should be taken rightly it was quite necessary that it should not be viewed as his sentence and admonition in 1 Cor. v. 1–8 had been, by which it had been said that he had wronged, ruined, and overreached the guilty man. To refer these expressions, as some do, to money matters is quite at variance with the context, and not at all necessitated by the language.



Digitized by Google

3 I speak not *this* to condemn *you:* for I have said before, that ye are in our hearts to die and live with *you.*

4 Great *is* my boldness of speech toward you, great *is* my glorying of you: I am filled with comfort, I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulation.

5 For, when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without *were* fightings, within *were* fears.

6 Nevertheless God, that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus;

7 And not by his coming only, but by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, when he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fervent mind toward me; so that I rejoiced the more.

---

3. Another reason why they should open their hearts. "**For condemnation I do not speak.**" The idea is not that the three apologetic sentences just uttered involved a condemnation of the Corinthians for putting him on his defence, but he denies that condemnation is the purpose of his *warning* in vi. 14—vii. 1, as appears from the proof:—"for I have said before that you are in our hearts **for union in death**, and **union in life**," being a clear allusion to vi. 11, 12 in the introduction to the warning. To have persons so in your heart that you are ready to die with them, that you have no desire to live without them, is one of the strongest tokens of love (Hor. Odes II., xvii. 5–12). But from another point of view a wish to spend your life with them may be a stronger, which possibly accounts for its standing second, inasmuch as it shews a conviction that the existing attachment will not only bring present delight, but that it will never be broken by the continual society of the persons loved. The view that the point is *their* dying and living with *him*, not his with them, imparts an obscurity, and the grounds for it, which are chiefly grammatical, are insufficient.

4. "Great is my **frankness** of speech towards you." This, again, plainly refers to vi. 11, and there is no reason to dilute the idea into "confidence," although the frankness *is* that of confidence in his readers. This, and not the desire to condemn, is the explanation of the unreservedness of his warning. More indicative of his love still than free speech to them is glorying speech to others "**on their behalf.**" The boasting of them to Titus was, no doubt, qualified, but, after what had occurred, he resumes it, and it was now "great." He is filled with "**the** comfort," of which he had already spoken in i. 4–7, on which he is going to dwell further on (6, 7); he superabounds with "**the** joy," which was implied in ii. 14, and to which he is going to surrender himself (7, 16) now that he has said all that is necessary in the way of self-defence and counsel. The tribulation meant is undoubtedly that of chap. i. although there would be no need to exclude the "*fightings*" in the next verse, if they were of sufficient importance to be put in the category of tribulation.

5. Takes up the narrative dropped in ii. 17 with an allusion to ii. 12, 13. "For even when we came into Macedonia, our flesh **got no relief**, but (we were) in **every respect** afflicted." Even on his arrival he had not only still to wait for Titus, but apparently fell among foes. "Without" and "within" explain in every respect. The fightings were the new troubles in Macedonia; the fears concerned the upshot of affairs in Corinth. In Troas his unrest was in spirit, now it is in his flesh. Possibly the perturbation of his higher nature descended to his lower.

6, 7. Affliction turned into joy. "**But** he that comforteth **the humble** comforted us viz. God, by **the presence of** Titus" (i. 3, 4). The mere arrival of a trusty colleague to stand by him and Timothy, downcast as they were, was a comfort. But the main relief came from the comfort which Titus felt over the Corinthians.' The strict sense is that Titus was comforted in and by delivering his report of his experience at Corinth, and that this his comfort comforted the Apostle. St. Paul might well feel the visible satisfaction of Titus to be a more palpable proof of the improved state of things than the substance of the report itself. Titus clearly delivered his account with joyful emotion, and indeed the scene which he had to describe was extraordinary, as may be seen in v. 11. The comfort was such as for the Apostle to "**feel rejoiced rather**" than troubled as before. The next verses which assign a reason for a *change of feeling*, as well as the aorist shew that this and not '*rejoiced the more*' (A. V.) is the true sense. The position of "rather" in the original is not, as alleged, against this. See 1 Cor. v. 2; vi. 7; vii. 21.

Digitized by Google

8 For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though *it were* but for a season.

9 Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry [1]after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing.

10 For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death.

11 For behold this selfsame thing,

[1] Or, *according to God.*

---

8, 9. The manner in which trouble had been superseded by joy. "**Because though I did grieve you in my letter, I do not regret. Though I did regret, for I see that that letter, though (it was) but for a season, did grieve you, now I rejoice.**" It seemed ungracious to speak of his joy without mention of the pain through which he had drawn his readers into a better mind, and hence the first statement. But even to say that he did not now regret was not sufficiently gracious, and hence the second statement, which acknowledges that he **did** feel regret, because his last and lost letter had given—as he now sees from the tidings of Titus—the pain which he anticipated. He had felt sorry at the thought of paining them even for a season, and it is only *now* on the receipt of the good news that he rejoices. It is impossible not to admire the refined delicacy of this representation, although the language is laboured. Even his expression that their grief was only for a time is an intimation that, so far as he was concerned, there was no reason why it should last longer. But his considerateness is not yet satisfied, so he further obviates all possible misapprehension about the motive of his joy, both negatively and positively. The original for '*after a godly manner*' (A.V.) is either 'according to God,' which may mean that their grief was according to the will of God and such as He approved, or '**with reference to God**,' which is better and would denote a grief felt by them in their relation to God. Their grief might have referred to themselves and been the vexation of hurt vanity, or to the author of it and been angry annoyance, or to the world and been mortification at the humiliation of the rebuke. But it had been genuine sorrow for the culpableness of their conduct in God's sight. "That ye should in nothing come to loss at our hands." The original is frequently used for the loss and mulct involved in punishment at the final judgment or such detriment done to the soul as may lead to that ultimate issue (Matt. xii. 26; Mark viii. 36; Luke ix. 25. See also 1 Cor. xiii. 15). That this is its meaning here is plain from its reference to the two opposite results in v. 10 salvation and death. Had the Apostle not written, and had they continued impenitent, it is clear how they might have incurred such detriment at his hands.

10. States two principles of Christian morals which shew how their grief wrought repentance and obliterated his regret. True grief for sin works a change of mind leading to salvation, and salvation is "**no matter of regret**," either to the recipients of it or their helpers. But the false grief which the world feels and which has no eye to God worketh death. This grief means, according to the context, not grief in general but the world's grief for rebuked sin, which consists of anger, rebelliousness, resentment for detection, for censure, for loss of reputation. This is the inward state of spiritual death, as salvation also here denotes the inward state of salvation. They culminate respectively in eternal death and eternal life.

11. The Apostle illustrates the first of the two principles just stated by the particular case before him, on the details of which he delights to dwell (cf. v. 7). "Behold" expresses the vividness with which he realised the scene described by Titus. "For behold **this very** (instance of) **being brought to** (aorist) **grief with reference to God, what great earnestness** it wrought for you." The '*ye*' of the A.V. should not stand in the text, and '*this very thing*' (A.V.) could only mean that it was the godly grief and *nothing else* that produced the results, which yields no sense. "Very" means that for proof of his general statement about the working of godly grief, he need go no further than the case in hand. "Earnestness" is the opposite of the real or seeming apathy which they had shewn with regard to the great offence. They were now roused to a keen sense of its enormity. "For you" means that this earnestness was for their spiritual good. In order to do full justice to their vehement emotions, of which earnestness was only one, a series of terms is added, each correcting and transcending its predecessor in force. They are six in number and run in pairs. The first pair refers to the stain brought upon the church: the second to the Apostle; the third to the offender. "Clearing of yourselves" or "self-defence" alludes to their apologies made to Titus and through



Digitized by Google

that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, *what* clearing of yourselves, yea, *what* indignation, yea, *what* fear, yea, *what* vehement desire, yea, *what* zeal, yea, *what* revenge! In all *things* ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter.

12 Wherefore, though I wrote unto you, *I did it* not for his cause that had done the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong, but that our care for you in the sight of God might appear unto you.

13 Therefore we were comforted in your comfort: yea, and exceed-

---

him to St. Paul. They could not have contended that they were blameless, but only that they had not *deliberately meant to countenance* the offence. Some had perhaps been silenced by threats and fear. The "indignation" would be directed not against the immoral person exclusively, but against all who had complicated the case and misrepresented St. Paul's treatment of it. "Fear" alludes to the disciplinary measures of which he had given warning, 1 Cor. v. 21. Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 1 ff. The word rendered '*vehement desire*' means a "**yearning**" for his presence (see ver. 7). They were tossed by opposite feelings. They dreaded his chastisement, yet longed for his coming, whether to receive the merited correction or a restoration to favour through contrition. The "zeal" is no longer, as in v. 7, "on my behalf" but, as the next term shews, for a vindication of the claims of purity in the person of him who had outraged it and of those who had aided and abetted. The last link of the chain is "**full exaction of punishment**," not only for the sin itself perhaps, but also for resistance to Apostolic authority. The allusion is to the severer penalty which, according to ii. 6, some members of the Church desired to impose, whatever it may have been. This point stands last, and completes the climax because the punishment in question had constituted St. Paul's chief difficulty all along. The summary about their conduct during the visit of Titus is:—"In every respect ye **commended** (aorist) yourselves (as) **pure** in the matter." They had proved themselves free from the contamination of countenancing an unchaste offence. The absence of a connecting particle gives the words something of the formality of a judicial sentence of acquittal. "In every respect" refers to all the particulars just specified in which they had commended themselves. A comparison of this sentence with 1 Cor. v. 6 might seem to imply that he had either overcharged the matter there or shewn a large leniency here. But the persons who are spoken of as glorying there are not identical with those fully absolved here. There was an extreme heathen as well as an extreme Judaizing party.

12. From this issue, which was exactly what he desired, may be inferred what his true motive for writing the painful letter had not and what it had been. He had not written on account of the wrongdoer. He had been accused of a personal antipathy to the offender which he repudiates (ii. 5). "**No more**" did he write "**on account of the wrong-sufferer.**" He had been charged with personal predilection for the wronged man which he also disclaims. If the son said he was of Cephas or of Apollos, and the father said he was of Paul, sectarianism would be sure to advance these imputations. St. Paul's disclaimer is rather in favour of the injured man having been a believer, not a heathen. His real object, which is still an inference from the effects of the letter (vv. 7, 11), is stated thus:—"**for the sake of our earnestness on your behalf being made manifest toward you** before God." The argument is that *such* effects so powerful, so extensive, so happy, could not have resulted from a letter written from mean or personal motives. "Wherefore" it must be concluded that it had been prompted by some higher feeling, and this was a desire that a manifestation of his zealous interest in the Church's welfare should be made towards its members "in the sight of God;" that is, not from any such considerations as had been insinuated, but from a deep and warm sense of duty and love, which would bear God's inspection. According to another reading, which has a preponderance of external evidence in its favour, the rendering would be: "for the sake of *your* earnestness on *our* behalf being made manifest towards" or "before" or as some say, "among you." It is difficult to think that the Apostle wrote this, but still he *may* have desired that the warm feeling of those who were attached to him should receive a manifestation before the Church generally. The reading seems to have arisen from a confusion of the pronouns for 'your' and 'our,' which occurs elsewhere and is well illustrated by the reading of the Cod. Sin. here:—'*your* earnestness on your behalf.'

13. "**For this reason,**" because this and no other had been his purpose, and because the facts shewed that it had been attained,

Digitized by Google

ingly the more joyed we for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed by you all.

14 For if I have boasted any thing to him of you, I am not ashamed; but as we spake all things to you in truth, even so our boasting, which *I made* before Titus, is found a truth.

15 And his [1]inward affection is more abundant toward you, whilst he remembereth the obedience of you all, how with fear and trembling ye received him.

[1] Gr. *bowels.*

16 I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all *things.*

---

"we **are** comforted." No comfort could have come from attaining such purposes as had been imputed to him. "**But besides our** (ἡμῶν) **comfort, we were more superabundantly rather rejoiced** at the joy of Titus." Such is the rendering of the true reading. The Apostle felt that 'comforted' was a term that did scanty justice to his feelings. It only stated that his previous anxiety had been removed, whereas he had an overflow of satisfaction and, in order to describe this, he corrects his expression and says he was superabundantly "**rather**" made glad than merely comforted. The ground of this exuberant gladness was the joy of Titus, for *his* comfort also had mounted to the higher level of joy, which is more than was stated in v. 7. The reason why the Apostle so exulted in this joy of Titus was:—"because his spirit **has been** refreshed of you all." The word "refreshed" alludes to the dejected spirits in which Titus had started on his discouraging mission at St. Paul's urgent request. Under such circumstances the Apostle's unusual delight at the scarcely anticipated issue and its effect on Titus is fully accounted for. He probably makes express mention of the satisfaction and joy which the Corinthians had given Titus because he wished to recommend him for further work amongst them (viii. 16, 17, 18). "Of you all," does not mean that the entire community but all the better-minded, whom the Apostle is now addressing, had refreshed him. Still the expression seems to denote that a larger number than he expected had proved penitent and loyal.

"**I was not put to shame**" is the right translation, not "*I am not ashamed*" (A.V.), and "**was** found" or "**proved** truth," not "*is found.*" It was a special ground of rejoicing to St. Paul that the conduct of the Corinthians had shewn the boast, which partly induced Titus to go, to be true, and that he was spared the humiliation of seeing his praise of them proved hollow. The truth of this boast he compares with his general veracity in all that he "said to them" in his preaching or his promises. As before (i. 17–20) he argued from the consistent truthfulness of his preaching to that of his promises, so now he represents all his utterances together, whether made *to* them or *about* them, as a uniform whole pervaded by the leaven of sincerity and truth. Some of his readers must have felt the fact that he had been delivering favourable sentiments about them at the very moment when they were listening to very unfavourable representations of him.

15. The impression made upon Titus by his visit, about which the Corinthians would be not a little anxious, was so favourable that the Apostle can use it as a seal of the established reconciliation between the Church and himself which he declares in v. 16. "His affections are more superabundantly towards you, as he remembers (from time to time) the obedience of you all." His love waxed stronger and stronger with every recollection of their readiness to comply fully with St. Paul's directions and his own counsels. This readiness had been apparent from the first moment of his arrival, for he could call to mind "how with fear and trembling they welcomed him." Their penitence seems to have begun even before his arrival, and it almost looks like the after-fruit of Timothy's mission. Their feelings were mixed, for they were glad to receive another emissary of the Apostle, as the word of the original (ἐδέξασθε) in some measure implies, but they dreaded the consequences of their previous conduct, as we may well imagine, when Titus presented himself with another letter from the hand of one whom they knew by infallible proofs to be the bearer of a divine commission.

16. The conclusion of the matter is a declaration at once of an amnesty for the past and of confidence for the future. It is also a transition link to the topic of the next two chapters for his "confidence in them in everything" enabled him without misgiving to urge their obligation on one special point.

Digitized by Google

## THE COLLECTION FOR THE POOR SAINTS AT JERUSALEM (VIII. IX.).

It had been customary since the Dispersion of Israel for the Jews and Proselytes in foreign lands to send 'sacred money' annually to Jerusalem through commissioners called Hieropompi. This usage *may* have suggested or facilitated the raising of subsidies in the gentile churches for the mother-church at Jerusalem. But the character as well as the motive of the contributions were different in the two cases, for whereas the Jewish consisted of the Temple tribute, which was paid from a feeling of religious patriotism and traditional obligation, the Christian consisted of free-will offerings for the alimony of the poor, and the duty of giving rested not only upon the Saviour's injunctions to succour the needy brethren but also upon the specific ground stated in Rom. xv. 27.

The sale and distribution of their possessions by the first converts to Christianity in Jerusalem could only have been a slight factor in causing their destitution. The provisions of the Mosaic law for preventing large accumulations of wealth on the one hand and extreme penury on the other had ceased to be operative. Judæa was in a state of social and economical confusion. The abnormal condition of the labour market is illustrated by the fact that Agrippa II. was compelled to resort to artificial means, such as paving the streets of Jerusalem with white marble, after having declined a proposal to destroy and rebuild Solomon's porch, in order to supply with work and wages 18,000 workmen who had been employed in repairing the Temple. At the same time an apprehension existed that the Romans intended to lay violent hands upon the Temple treasury. Life and property were rendered painfully insecure by the terrible atrocities of the Sicarii, at once assassins and robbers, who, although the Christians were not likely to be the direct objects of their attacks, must have helped to make the means of their subsistence precarious. There was a famine in the reign of Claudius and the privations accompanying it, for the mitigation of which St. Paul had previously been instrumental in providing (Acts xi. 29, 30), may have been still continuing. Independently of the general disorder, it is easy to comprehend how difficult the Christians, regarded as renegades from the national faith may have found it to earn their daily bread, and their sufferings were probably much more severe than is usually imagined.

It was not general Christian duty merely nor even his fervent love towards his brethren according to the flesh (Rom. ix. 2, 3), which drew the Apostle heart and soul into the work of relief. One of the articles in the compact concluded between him and the pillar-apostles in A.D. 51 (Gal. ii. 10) was that he should remember the poor amongst the Jewish believers. His preaching and ministry were looked upon with no great favour by many at Jerusalem, and some even doubted whether his churches were properly Christian communities at all. The wider and remoter his missionary activity became the more would these misgivings gather strength, and they had been confirmed by recent reports from Corinth. An extreme party, which pretended to the support of orthodox persons in the parent Church, had pursued him with hostility into the field of his labours and had strained every nerve to destroy his work. He was on the point of bringing his ministry in the East to a close, and what might befall his Gentile foundations, when he was no longer present to fight their battle, must have caused him grave concern. If, before his departure for the far west, he could send or convey to Jerusalem, as a last memorial of himself, a bountiful gift from the heathen brethren to the impoverished members of the mother community, he might anticipate that it would have a favourable effect with reference to all the matters which he had now deeply at heart. It would be a testimony that he was as faithful as ever to the contract between him and the original Apostles and that there was not a great chasm between them and him, as it pleased his adversaries to assert. It would be a proof that both he

Digitized by Google

and his converts fully recognised the cardinal Christian principle of brotherly love and would shew indirectly but forcibly that they were anxious to maintain the bond of a common faith with Jewish believers. He might hope that distrustful members of the mother-church would look with less doubting eyes upon the Gentile brotherhoods and give no countenance to the adversaries, who would no doubt pursue their work when he was gone.

It would seem from Rom. xv. 25 that the collection treated in these chapters (viii., ix.) was restricted to the Churches of Macedonia and Corinth, the charity of the Galatian Churches (1 Cor. xvi. 1) and perhaps of others in Asia Minor having been apparently already forwarded to Jerusalem. The first announcement of the subscription at Corinth was taken up eagerly, but no energetic measures were adopted for giving effect to good intentions, although there was no lack of means (viii. 14), and it is, in fact, patent that a lukewarmness had supervened if not a positive indisposition to proceed with the undertaking. The causes of this change of feeling are not far to seek. A conflict between the Church and the Apostle had intervened and a partial alienation, which was the main impediment to the work. Some feared that they would only impoverish themselves by giving (viii. 13). An impression had been inculcated that the Apostle resorted too freely to these exactions of money (xii. 17, 18), and the malignant insinuation had been thrown out that he had an eye to his private advantage. The Judaizers, although they might have been expected to yield to no one in zeal for such a cause, no doubt resisted it with all their might, partly from hatred to St. Paul's teaching and person, partly because they foresaw that the success of the scheme tended to overthrow their own influence. This attitude of things would be observed by Titus and reported to the Apostle, who seems thoroughly to have comprehended the entire situation. It was not one which promised a brilliant issue to his cherished project, but still the reaction of feeling in his favour and the enthusiastic regard for him, manifested in the presence of Titus by a considerable portion of the Church, furnished sufficient grounds for hoping that he might not only rekindle the flame of charity which had sunk down into its embers, but stir up such an activity as might lead to an immediate practical result not unworthy of a Church which had been so highly gifted with other graces.

With this object in view and aided by the splendid example of Macedonian self-sacrifice, of which he was an eye-witness, he writes these two chapters, which leave no motive-spring of Christian bounty untouched, and which are pervaded with a spirit of united earnestness, delicacy, and simplicity. Their position in the general structure of the Epistle is most intelligible, for they constitute an admirable supplement to its first and conciliatory portion and it would have been impossible from the nature of their contents to have appended them to the unsparing polemic against his irreconcilable antagonists (x.—xiii.) without awakening a painful sense of disharmony.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

1 *He stirreth them up to a liberal contribution for the poor saints at Jerusalem, by the example of the Macedonians,* 7 *by commendation of their former forwardness,* 9 *by the example of Christ,* 14 *and by the spiritual profit that shall redound to themselves thereby:* 16 *commending to them the integrity and willingness of Titus, and those other brethren, who upon his request, exhortation, and commendation, were purposely come to them for this business.*

MOREOVER, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia;

---

CHAP. VIII. 1. "**But** we notify to you, brethren, the grace of God which is **given in the** Churches of Macedonia." "**But**" denotes transition to a new topic in slight antithesis to the confidence (vii. 16). He has confidence in them, but there is something by which his trust

2 How that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality.

3 For to *their* power, I bear record, yea, and beyond *their* power *they were* willing of themselves;

4 Praying us with much intreaty that we would receive the gift, and *take upon us* the fellowship of the ministering to the saints.

5 And *this they did*, not as we hoped, but first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God.

6 Insomuch that we desired Titus,

---

may be further substantiated. "We notify" is also a preparatory phrase, emphasizing the subject which it introduces. It is peculiar to the group of St. Paul's Epistles to which 2 Cor. belongs (Bp. Lightfoot, Gal. i. 11). The term "brethren" too, often announces fresh matter. Here it strikes the key-note of the section, as brotherly-love is the motive of alms-giving. The zeal of the Macedonians, to which St. Paul was an eye-witness, was an excellent starting-point for his topic and calculated to provoke emulation. The first cause of Christian alms-giving is the grace of God, and the specific link connecting cause and effect, and making "the grace of God *given* to become the grace of God *giving*," is stated in vv. 8, 9. The grace "**given in** the Churches," denotes that the churches were receptacles and *abiding-places* of the grace.

**2.** "That, in **much approvedness** of affliction, the super-abundance of their joy and their deep-searching poverty superabounded to the riches of their **singlemindedness**." It is said of them in 1 Thess. i. 6, that they "received the word in much affliction with joy of the Holy Ghost." Out of persecutions (Acts xvii. 6 ff.; 1 Thess. ii. 14; iii. 2, 3, 5) sprung both joy (Acts v. 41; Rom. v. 3, 4, 5, 11; xiv. 17; Gal. v. 22) and poverty, the former superabounding, the latter draining and eating so deep down into their substance that bounty seemed impossible. Yet these two opposites working in combination like an alkali and an acid, brought about an overflowing result which is called "the riches of their single-mindedness." Single-mindedness is that state of heart in which a man does not regard his own slender means nor any selfish consideration, but has his eye fixed exclusively upon his brother's needs. The Apostle says not that the contribution, but that the single-mindedness was rich, because it was *this* that he wished to awaken in the Corinthians. Should it operate upon Corinthian wealth instead of Macedonian poverty, the harvest would be plentiful.

**3, 4.** This single-mindedness is proved and illustrated by:—1. The liberality of the gift. It had been in proportion to and even beyond (παρά) the power of the givers. 2. The motive. They had acted "**on their own choice**" (αὐθαίρετοι) without compulsion or urging. They went further, "with much entreaty begging of us **the grace and the fellowship of the ministry which is to the saints.**" The words in the A.V. "that we would receive" have no claim to stand in the text. "**Grace**" approximates the idea of 'favour,' although many expositors think this sense derogatory to the dignity of so important a word. But see Eph. iv. 29; James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5. The charitable gift itself is a "grace" in 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 19, and there seems to be no reason why the Apostle's permission to join in it should not have the same name, especially when the request was based upon the consideration that the work was a holy service (viii. 1) done to holy persons. The original for "fellowship" (κοινωνία), does not mean merely 'participation,' but 'making or having common cause.' There is always at the root of its meaning in the N. T. the idea of Christian communion in one form or other. Those who bestow charity make common cause both with one another and with the recipients. Context and language point here to a community of cause on the part of the Macedonians with the Corinthians rather than with the receivers of the gift. See however Rom. xvi. 29. The term for "ministering" (διακονία) often denotes serving up meats at table, and the order of Deacons in the Church took its title from that sense in accordance with the origin of the office, Acts vi. 2. The word is therefore very appropriate here. The expressions are not to be amalgamated in compliance with a questionable figure called Hendiadys, into 'the grace of fellowship.' Both "the grace" and "the fellowship" express the *grounds* of the entreaty. The Macedonians regarded the leave to act upon the desire to give, put into their hearts by God (v. 1), as a gracious privilege to be obtained from the Apostle, and the nature of such giving, which was an act of fellowship with believers, heightened the ardour of their desire.

**5.** The crowning excellency of their bounty is described negatively and positively. It was not such as the Apostle had hoped. Hope

Digitized by Google

that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you the same grace also.

7 Therefore, as ye abound in every *thing*, *in* faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and *in* all diligence, and *in* your love to us, *see* that ye abound in this grace also.

8 I speak not by commandment, but by occasion of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sincerity of your love.

---

need not be diluted into surmise or expectation. He had hoped well of them, but, on account of their poverty had looked for only slender assistance. On the contrary, however, they made no slight contribution, nor was their gift one of money merely, but of themselves, first and foremost, to the Lord, who gave Himself for them (Gal. i. 4; ii. 20), and also to the Apostle, as the minister, through whom Christ's self-sacrifice had been made known to them, and through whom the work of love for the saints was proceeding. "First" may mean to Christ primarily and chiefly, and to the Apostle secondarily and subordinately, or that the greater gift of themselves was made in *the first instance*, the subsequent less important gift of their substance being not expressly mentioned but implied. In any case they placed themselves and all that they possessed at the absolute disposal of Christ and his Apostle. This they did "through the will of God" working upon their will (v. i.) with prompting and solicitation, yet they acted "of their own choice," because of their instant and eager compliance with the divine impulse.

**6.** These noble manifestations are enough —"**for us to exhort Titus**, that according as he **previously initiated**, so he should also **perfect towards you this** grace also." The self-devotion and self-sacrifice of the Macedonians induced him to take steps which should draw the Corinthians also into the same strong current of charity, and prevent them from being outstripped by other Churches. The mention of this exhortation would save Titus from any imputation of having *put himself* too prominently forward as an agent in a money matter, whether this was the Apostle's purpose in mentioning it or not. The words both for "initiate" (ἐνάρχεσθαι) and for "perfect" (vii. 1) are hieratic terms, the former referring to the preliminary rites, the latter to the due and full performance of sacrifice. They are happily applied here to the "oblations" of almsgiving. Titus had, as we may easily suppose, intimated to the Corinthians that the best mode of giving substantial confirmation to their professions of zeal for the Apostle was at once to set about the execution of this lingering plan of charity, and they had apparently acted upon his counsel but, through the shortness of his stay, had not completed the work. The "also" in "this grace also" refers to the other happy results which Titus had attained, or it may be taken in the same sense as "also" at the end of the next verse. "**Perfect towards you**" means that Titus was commissioned to accomplish a *good service to* the Corinthians.

The Corinthians presented a marked contrast to the Macedonians, for they had shewn an alacrity to give without doing anything: they had suffered no persecution or affliction; they were comparatively wealthy (v. 14); they had been reminded of their duty, 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3: they had not given themselves to Christ, nor yet to Christ's minister, the Apostle, but had held themselves in reserve from unworthy considerations; they had fallen short of St. Paul's hopes: yet he is so jealous for the honour of the Church of his pride and affection, that he sends a colleague attached to it by newly-knitted bonds of love, to help them forward in their duty, that they may fall behind in no gift.

**7.** He had apparently thought of trying here by exhortation or reasoning to remove the difficulties which he knew stood in the way of Titus's success. "**But**" he abstains. "**But**" should be substituted for '*therefore*' in the A.V. He only desires that their charitable giving should be on a par with the riches of their other graces. It would be very inconsistent if persons of high Christian endowments should fail in the chief grace of charity. To throw themselves into a work which the Apostle had so warmly at heart was also only a natural mode of proving the love for him, which he says, in effect, as is much clearer in the original than in the A.V., comes from the depth of 'your heart and is settled in the depth of mine.'

**8.** His applications for money had been misconstrued into a sort of claim to lordship over their property, and he had not escaped the charge of malversation. When he says that he is "not speaking **by way of command**," he repudiates these imputations and also accounts partly for his refraining in the last verse from all further injunctions. A command would have been a reflection upon their love, and Christian bounty is not, in fact, a fit subject for command, as its virtue depends upon its spontaneity. He is only "testing through the warm zeal of others the genuineness of your love also." He was doing them the

Digitized by Google

9 For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.

10 And herein I give *my* advice:

---

good service of enabling and inducing them to shew that their Christian love was as genuine as the eagerness of the Macedonians proved *theirs* to be. The love may be, as in the last verse, that of the Corinthians for the Apostle, but it need not be so restricted. It may embrace Christ, St. Paul and the brethren.

**9.** The reason why he does not speak by way of command is that his readers **know** the great motive to Christian charity. Christ's act of self-sacrifice is attributed to the "grace of Christ" only here and in Rom. v. 15, and in Gal. i. 6 compared with v. 4. The expression places that great act in the category of manifestations of brotherly love and marks its suitableness as an example in the present case (vv. 1, 4, 6, 7), for it was in the truest and fullest sense a benefaction to the needy. The title "Lord" magnifies the condescension of the grace and turns the example into an *à fortiori.* "Jesus," the individual name of the Saviour, presents the act as one of personal favour. "Christ" also enhances the dignity of the grace, and, if it be allowable to take it in the sense of 'anointed with the spirit of holiness' (Rom. i. 4), it points to the unspeakable love of the Holy One of God suffering for the unholy. "For your sakes he became poor, although he was rich, in order that you, by His poverty, should **become** rich." "For your sakes" standing first, points the motive for charity emphatically. Believers are to consider that Christ impoverished Himself *for them* in order that they might be enriched in an immeasurably higher sense than that of worldly riches and, in gratitude, they are to follow His example on a humbler level, by doing an incomparably slighter thing, sacrificing a portion of their worldly substance to supply the natural needs of those who are Christ's. "When" or "although he was rich" refers to the form of existence which Christ had with the Father before the Incarnation, and the question with regard to "became poor" is what was the nature and extent of the poverty which He assumed when "The Word became flesh." It consisted both in what He gave up and in what He took.

He gave up the *circumstances* of heavenly glory; those splendours surrounding the throne of God, which St. John depicts figuratively in the Apocalypse. The passage is thought by some to imply that Christ, without ceasing to be essentially God, which He assuredly never did, surrendered also the divine *attributes* in the Incarnation. Its parallel, according to this view, is considered to be Phil. ii. 7, where it is said that He "emptied" or "stripped" Himself, and this is there explained by the statement that He did not think the "form of God," by which is meant the form and "the characteristic attributes of God" (Bp. Lightfoot), a thing to be clutched with a tight grasp, but relinquished it. Whether surrender of the attributes and retention of the essence of Godhead is a contradiction; if not, how far and in what sense Christ made such surrender; by what term out of many suggested since the "deposuit Deum" of Irenaeus it is to be designated, and how far it is strictly consistent with the doctrine of the *assumptio* humanitatis, are questions beyond the scope of a commentary. The reader may be referred to Steinmeyer, Geschichte der Geburt des Herrn, pp. 45–93, and Godet, Etudes bibliques, 2<sup>me</sup> Série, pp. 130–142. Two things are absolutely certain, that Christ never parted with the substance of Godhead, and that, when He was in the flesh, he exercised powers of Godhead. But it is contended by those who favour the above view that He received these back from the Father from time to time, according as His work required them and in answer to His prayers. Christ took the imperfections of a human mode of existence, circumstantial, such as poverty, and physical, such as liability to exhaustion, pain, and death. He accepted contact with sin in others, and the capacity of temptation, being tempted Himself. He stooped to the very humblest offices of love (John xiii. 3). But that the chief element of His poverty was His suffering and His death on the cross for sin is the purport of Phil. ii. 6–8. The object of this self-impoverishment was "That you by His poverty should **become** rich." This object was, of course, universal, and is specifically applied to the Corinthians in order to bring home to them the motive to charity. Christ parted with his riches and took our poverty, in order that we might part with our poverty and take *His* riches. Man is to be raised from earth to heaven, from humiliation to glory. He is to be transfigured into the image of Christ, that is, he is not only to be perfected in his human nature, but also to become Godlike. This is the purport of the great statement of Rom. viii. 29 (Heb. ii. 10–13, 2 Cor. iii. 18). When he has attained to that state, the final cause of his creation and existence will be achieved.

**10.** "And" carries back the connection through v. 9 to v. 8. "**And it is an opinion**"

Digitized by Google

for this is expedient for you, who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be [1]forward a year ago.

[1] Gr. *willing*.

11 Now therefore perform the doing *of it;* that as *there was* a readiness to will, so *there may be* a performance also out of that which ye have.

12 For if there be first a willing mind, *it is* accepted according to that a man hath, *and* not according to that he hath not.

13 For *I mean* not that other men be eased, and ye burdened:

14 But by an equality, *that* now at this time your abundance *may be a supply* for their want, that their abundance also may be *a supply* for your want: that there may be equality:

15 As it is written, [a]He that *had gathered* much had nothing over; and he that *had gathered* little had no lack.

[a] Ex. 16. 18.

---

or "**judgment that I offer** in this matter," not a command. What weight was to be attached to his opinion appears from 1 Cor. vii. 25, 40. "For this is expedient for you" does not mean that it is expedient for them that he should give a judgment rather than a command, which would fall short of his high sense of the word 'expedient.' It refers to the *substance* of his judgment in v. 7, that they should "abound in this grace also," as they did in others, which was conducive to their spiritual welfare. "Inasmuch **as not only the performance, but also the willingness ye were beforehand in initiating** since last year." The nerve of the exhortation is the *start* taken by the Corinthians which explains the order of ideas. They were the first to take steps towards doing, and had a still earlier precedence in the will to do. The more bound were they to expedite the performance now. How far the expression "since last year" dates back is not clear, but it points to a time prior to the First Epistle, for 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, 4 shews that the collection was not prospering.

**11.** "**But now perfect,**" i.e. duly and fully accomplish "the doing" or "performance also, that, just as there is the readiness of willing, so (there may be) also the perfecting" or "full accomplishment, **according to the having,**" i. e. in proportion to the measure in which you possess the means. The original for "now" is a form which lays stress upon the present moment, in antithesis to the length of time expressed in 'a year ago,' during which performance had lagged behind will.

**12.** The reason why the giving is to be "**according to the having,**" why a man is required to give only "according to his power" (v. 3) is that the value of the gift in God's sight depends upon the good will of the giver. "For **if the ready will is patent** (obvious), **according** to what **it may have, it is right acceptable,** not according to what it hath not." The words 'any man' (A.V.) have no right in the text; "the ready will" is personified. Its patency, like its acceptableness, refers to God. Some think that the word (προκεῖται) which expresses this patency means merely 'is present,' but that falls short of its full sense.

**13, 14.** This standard is to be applied to the present case: "**for the object is not for others ease (relief) and for you straits,** but," on the contrary, the true design proceeds "**on a principle of equality: in the present season your superabundance for their lack,** in order that **their superabundance also may serve for your lack,** in order that there may be **brought about** an equality." The Apostle is probably glancing at actual discontent inspired by his adversaries about his requisition of money. "Ease" denotes a relaxation from a previous strain. "Straits" is the pressure or pinch of poverty. Res angusta. Givers are not to incur the latter in order that receivers may enjoy the former. Such a result is to be prevented by the only true communism, which depends upon times, circumstances, free will, and love, and which, in a Christian brotherhood, so adjusts ever-changing inequalities that no one shall starve while another has abundance. The Apostle gently reminds his readers that they may, one day, need a requital in kind from those whom they assist.

**15.** The end and aim of charity illustrated by the divine example in giving manna in the wilderness. "He (that gathered) **his** much **got nothing the more,** and he (that gathered) **his** little **got nothing the less.**" St. Paul regards the ordinance that whatever amount each individual had gathered was found on measuring to be no more than "an omer for every man" (Ex. xvi. 16–18), as an index to the kind of equality which God contemplated in a holy community. Only what was effected under the old Dispensation by a wonder-working providence is left, under the new, as a gracious task for brotherly

Digitized by Google

16 But thanks *be* to God, which put the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you.

17 For indeed he accepted the exhortation; but being more forward, of his own accord he went unto you.

18 And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise *is* in the gospel throughout all the churches;

19 And not *that* only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this [1]grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and *declaration of* your ready mind:

[1] Or, *gift*.

20 Avoiding this, that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us:

21 Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men.

22 And we have sent with them our brother, whom we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things,

---

love to perform in the inevitable unevenness of earthly possessions.

**16-24.** Recommendation of the delegates whom he sends to superintend the collection.

**16, 17.** He thanks God "who **giveth** the same zeal" on behalf of his readers which animated himself, "**in** the heart of Titus.' For the phrase "giveth **in**," see v. 1. The proof of his zeal was that he welcomed the exhortation of v. 6, but being too much in earnest to require it, he went forth "**of his own choice**." He had already in his own mind desired and chosen the mission for himself, but had waited deferentially as St. Paul's subordinate for the appointment and exhortation, and had welcomed it when given. He had not yet actually gone forth, but the tenses are epistolary aorists.

**18, 19.** The commendation of the first of Titus's two companions might mean either that he had written a Gospel, or was distinguished as a preacher or as a worker in the Gospel cause. For the first meaning there is practically nothing to be said, and of the other two the last is the best, for the fact that a man was a conspicuous *preacher* did not necessarily fit him for participation in a matter of diaconal business. He was further qualified by an election at the hands of the Macedonian churches, in which no doubt he had achieved his reputation, to go abroad with (συνέκδημος) the Apostle and others to Jerusalem as a fellow-bearer of the contributions. The Macedonians who *did* accompany St. Paul from Greece to Asia, were Sopater, Aristarchus, and Secundus (Acts xx. 4), and one of these is probably the person here spoken of. The Apostle says "not only (that), but also elected,' as if, instead of "whose praise is in the Gospel," he had written 'praised in the Gospel.' The object of his election in this capacity was "for," i.e. "to promote the glory of God and a warm desire of ours" (ἡμῶν not ὑμῶν). This end would be served by a fellow-deacon freely chosen by one group of churches to act with a second church in aiding a third, and to save the undertaking from all stain of carelessness or dishonesty. It was natural that the Apostle should desire this, and his intimation that he did so shews that this delegate was not imposed upon him by the Macedonians.

**20.** He states, with a slightly irregular participial construction which occurs more than once in this epistle (i. 7) that the chief reason why he desired the election of this delegate was to avoid all possible censure for malversation. When he speaks of a "rich abundance" he clearly takes into account what he anticipated from the Corinthians, and so gives them a hint to generosity. The larger the sum the easier might appropriation seem. The original for "avoiding this" would be a little better rendered by "**using this precaution**," the metaphor involved in the word being that of reefing sail in order to shun danger.

**21.** The maxim upon which his precaution is based is taken from Prov. iii. 4, "**For we take forethought** for what is honourable." He makes provision that his conduct shall be such as not only is honourable or honest in itself, but also brings him the *reputation* of honesty which he cannot disregard when Christ's cause is in question.

**22.** Titus's second companion must have been a coadjutor of St. Paul in *matters of business* connected with his ministry, for the word rendered "diligent" in the A.V. signifies zeal and energy in the transaction of affairs. He may have been a missionary deacon, which would agree with his employment in this collection. The way in which he is mentioned implies that he was not a Macedonian. The original gives force to the commendation by reiterating the same word four times, which the English is obliged to vary by 'many' and 'much.' "Whom we **approved zealous in** many things **many** times, but at this time much more **zealous by reason of much confidence towards you**." His confidence

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *he hath.*

but now much more diligent, upon the great confidence which [1]*I have* in you.

23 Whether *any do enquire* of Titus, *he is* my partner and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren *be enquired of*, *they are* the messengers of the churches, *and* the glory of Christ.

24 Wherefore shew ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf.

---

makes it probable that he was the brother who accompanied Titus on his recent mission (xii. 18), for, if he had been an eyewitness of what is reported in ch. vii. 7, 11, his confidence, of which the ground is otherwise not apparent, is explained. As he and the other brother are both called "messengers of the Churches" in the next verse, St. Paul must have obtained a regular commission for him also and, if it extended to the conveyance of the money to Jerusalem, he may have been either Gaius, or Tychicus or Trophimus, Acts xx. 4. Of the three Tychicus is much the most likely, for both in Eph. vi. 21, and Col. iv. 7 he is called a "faithful minister" (διάκονος) of the Apostle, and in both cases he is sent with a commission, as he is also in 2 Tim. iv. 12, and another is contemplated for him in Titus iii. 12.

**23.** Epitome of recommendation for all three. "Whether (I speak) **for** Titus, he is my partner and fellow-worker towards you, or (they for whom I speak are) our brethren, they are emissaries of the Churches, the glory of Christ." "Fellow-worker towards you," refers mainly to Titus's recent mission, which was his best claim to a welcome on a second visit. The commendation here given of the other brethren is official. They are no subalterns or partisans of the Apostle sent to push his cause in Corinth, but accredited representatives of the Churches, and entitled in that capacity to a respect more than could belong to them as individuals. The last words of the verse shew that he would have this respect carried to the pitch of reverence, for in these men who come to do Christ's work as the legates of the Churches, which are Christ's body, the glory of Christ Himself, who is the head, is reflected.

**24.** The representative character of these delegates involves a further inducement to a cordial welcome of them, and co-operation in their work. **"The manifestation of your love, therefore, and of our boasting on your behalf in manifesting to them,** (ye manifest it) **before the face of the Churches."** Such is the rendering of the true reading (ἐνδεικνύμενοι). The argument cuts two ways, for while, in shewing their love, whether to the Apostle or the messengers, or to the poor saints, or to all three, and in verifying St. Paul's boasting of them, they would win honour and glory in the eyes of the Churches, so, on the other hand, if they fell short, their Christian good name would incur a tarnish, for, of course, a report of their conduct would go back to the Macedonian communities.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

*1 He yieldeth the reason why, though he knew their forwardness, yet he sent Titus and his brethren beforehand. 6 And he proceedeth in stirring them up to a bountiful alms, as being but a kind of sowing of seed, 10 which shall return a great increase to them, 13 and occasion a great sacrifice of thanksgivings unto God.*

FOR as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you:

---

CHAP. IX. A little perplexity is caused by the Apostle seeming to take a fresh start with the same topic, as if it had not been mentioned before. It has been thought that a new letter begins here; or that there was an interval between writing ch. viii. and ch. ix.; or that he intended to dismiss the subject with ch. viii., but on glancing it over again, deemed a supplement desirable. It is indisputable that he *has* urged the duty of ministering to the saints in viii. 7–15, and that he reverts to it again in ix. 6–14. But the connection obviously runs straight on from viii. 24 to ix. 1 ff, and there was still something to be added since the *precise* object for which he sent the envoys (ix. 3–5) has not been declared, and though it might be superfluous to urge liberality to the Saints, yet there were one or two considerations which might profitably be mentioned even upon that head (ix. 6–10). Further, had he failed to point out how the

Digitized by Google

2 For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many.

3 Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready:

4 Lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye)

---

charitable work tended to the glory of God and strengthened the communion of saints throughout the world (ix. 11–14), he would have omitted what constituted its chief significance.

1. He seems to reflect that in viii. 16–24 he had been writing rather about the receivers of the collection than of the givers or the giving, and therefore explains this circumstance. "For about the ministry to the saints **indeed** it is superfluous for me to write to you." Our own use of language shews that when we say it is superfluous to touch upon a topic, we do not mean strictly either that we have not touched upon it or do not intend to touch upon it. The very word "indeed" (μέν) implies that there *is* something to come in connection with this subject, and in slight contrast with the superfluity of writing about it. It does come in v. 3. "About the ministry **indeed** it is superfluous to write," "but I send the brethren." Again v. 6 is also in antithesis to v. 1. It was superfluous to urge ministering to the saints in a letter "but **this**" he would call to their notice—"he that soweth sparingly, &c." This connection is not indeed put as a classical writer would have put it but it does not exceed the usual freedom of St. Paul's style. There is an emphasis upon "the ministry to the saints," implying that for such a work there is no need of urging—and this may be the *entire* force of the particle (μέν). There is a slight stress also upon "to write" given by the addition of the article in the original, which serves to bring *writing* into relief against the *sending* of the brethren in v. 3. "To you" is likewise made prominent by standing last. To write to *them* was superfluous.

2. We might have expected to hear at once what he did instead of writing. But that he defers, and assigns the reason why he need not write to *them*, which is his knowledge of their ready will. This he specifies here, because it had led him to something else closely related to his *exact* object in sending the brethren, which he is on the point of stating. It had caused him to boast of the Corinthians having had their contribution ready since the previous year, and that boast had produced its intended effect of stimulating the Macedonians. The question is how *he could* so boast, for it is implied that he was still boasting. There is little doubt that he had made timely preparations beforehand for this collection, and communicated with the Macedonian churches, as he had with that of Corinth. It was probably in one of these early communications that he first made the boast in question, and it must have been before writing the First Epistle, because 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3 shews that the collection was anything but ready. The disorder in the Church had, in fact, then begun, and had since culminated, so that everything had been for a season in confusion. Had this continued, there could have been no further boasting. But after the reassuring success of Titus, the Apostle's hopes revived, and he had the courage not to recall the original boast. He could still hope that, when he himself arrived, the collection would actually be ready, and if this was not quite the same thing as having had it ready since the previous year, it implies no such disregard of facts as needs defence or excuse. That he is speaking of his boasting in the past appears from the sentence: "the zeal (which started) from you **provoked the greater part.**" It is not '*hath provoked*' as in the A. V. There is no inconsistency between this and the assertion that the Macedonians had subscribed "of their own choice." He speaks here only of "the greater part," i. e., of the many persons found in all churches, who are actuated by secondary motives, good in themselves but not the highest.

3. It is now plain why, although it was superfluous to write, it was not so to send the brethren. "But I **send** the brethren, that our boast may not be **made void in this particular,**" that is, in the complete readiness of the collection, as he goes on to explain:—"in order that, as I (repeatedly) said (you were), you may be ready." The careful specification, "in this particular" may mean that in any case their willingness to give would not be doubted. That however was not now the main point, but that the fruits should be gathered in before his arrival.

4. Personal humiliation would ensue if this object were not attained. 'They of Macedonia,' in the A. V., should be simply "**Macedonians,**" and for 'this same confident boasting' should be read "**this confidence,**" the word 'boasting' having no

Digitized by Google

should be ashamed in this same confident boasting.

5 Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up beforehand your [1]bounty, [1]whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as *a matter of* bounty, and not as *of* covetousness.

[1] Gr. *blessing.*
[1] Or, *which hath been so much spoken of before.*

6 But this *I say*, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully.

7 Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, *so let him give;* not grudgingly, or of necessity: for [a] God loveth a cheerful giver.

8 And God *is* able to make all

[a] Prov. 11. 25. Rom. 12. 8. Ecclus. 35. 9.

---

right to stand in the text. These Macedonians would be an escort of honour, which might probably accompany him. He wished to spare himself from being brought to shame for false confidence and them for unreadiness before members of Churches which, poor as they were, had just given proof of large bounty.

5. As an inference from this, and in order to avoid misconstruction, he states with emphasis his *exact* aim, which was that everything should be done *beforehand* and *previously* to his coming, as he shews by touching this point three times. The stress laid upon "necessary" by its position in the original and the force of the term itself indicate how important he thought this. The brethren who were to go on before perhaps required 'exhortation,' because they had wished to accompany the Apostle himself, as a part of his escort of honour. "That they should come beforehand to you and set in order beforehand your **blessing, which has been promised** beforehand (προεπ. not προκατηγγελμένην), that this should be ready, **so as a blessing, not as covetousness.**" The word for 'setting in order' is often used for restoring that which has fallen into disrepair, and is appropriate to the re-adjustment and completing of a business in which there had been flaws and delays. "Promised beforehand" means promised to the Apostle, not to the Saints of Jerusalem or to the Macedonians by the Apostle. Under the old covenant God called the plentiful fruits of the earth his blessing, the original term for which here is properly *spoken* blessing. Lev. xxv. 24. Ez. xxxiv. 26. Similarly the barrenness of the ground is God's curse. Gen. iii. 1. Hence according to their strictly religious view of temporal goods, the Jews called all benefactions blessings. The root of the idea is that God's words are always realised. His good spoken is good done; His benediction, benefaction. The two following verses (6, 7) shew that, when a human gift is called "a blessing" its bounties and spontaneity are meant, such being the characteristics of God's gifts. Yet the words "so as a blessing and not as covetousness" are not a hint to give freely and liberally so much as to give promptly, because it is in the nature of a blessing to be *ready* at the moment when it is wanted, and in the nature of covetousness, which wishes to keep for itself what it gives away, not to give until the last moment.

6. To write that they should give liberally would have been superfluous, "yet *this*" he allows himself to say. Giving is not a sacrifice, but a sowing followed by a reaping, and as is the sowing, so the reaping: spare sowing, spare reaping; rich sowing, rich reaping. The giver of the recompense is, of course, God. Both idea and language are taken from the Old Testament. See Prov. xi. 24, where the word of the LXX. for 'scatter' is σπείρειν.

There need not have been so much discussion about the construction of the first words:—"But this." There is no necessity to supply any verb at all. It is only a short formula, used by one dictating rapidly, in order to emphasize what follows. The precise sense of the last words of the verse is: "He that soweth **on the principle of blessings, on the principle of blessings** shall also reap." The plural number "blessings" serves to bring out the fulness of the truly charitable man's giving.

7. Passes from amount to motive, and states the inward moral condition, without which no man can reap. His sowing must spring out of deliberate preference, not out of a state of mind in which grief is felt at parting with possessions, nor out of compulsion, in which a man thinks that he *must* give, whether for respectability, reputation, position, or from urgent admonition. "(Let) each (give) according as he **has deliberately preferred** (perf.) **with** his heart, not out of grief or out of necessity." See Deut. xv. 10. "Thou shalt surely give, and thine heart shall not be grieved" (οὐ λυπηθήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ LXX). The reason for their giving, "for it is a cheerful giver that God loveth," is a reminiscence of an addition made by the LXX. to the Hebrew Text in Prov. xxii. 8, "a man that is cheerful and a giver God blesseth." "Loveth," which St. Paul

Digitized by Google

grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all *things*, may abound to every good work:

[b] Ps. 112. 9.

9 (As it is written, [b]He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: his righteousness remaineth for ever.

10 Now he that [c]ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for *your* food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness;)

[c] Is. 55. 10.

11 Being enriched in every thing to all bountifulness, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God.

---

substitutes for "blesseth," shows the connection of ideas, for the harvest of blessings springs from God's love.

8. A further inducement is God's ability to bestow abundant means of charity. His power is not restricted to dispensing spiritual blessings only, for He "is able to make *all* grace superabound" and to give temporal goods as well. God's purpose however is not to gratify selfishness, but "in order that having all **self-sufficiency** in everything at all times, ye may superabound to every good work." Our language is compelled twice to substitute "every" instead of the uniform Greek for "all," which occurs four times in this short sentence to express the completeness of God's giving. The original for "deliberate preference" in the last verse occurs nowhere else in the N. T. and that for "**self-sufficiency**" only once again (1 Tim. vi. 6). Both are found in the Ethics of Aristotle, and 'deliberate preference' plays an important part in his moral system. He defines self-sufficiency (Eth. I. vii. 6, 7) as that which, without the addition of anything, makes life eligible and *in want of nothing*. That it does not here mean an inward feeling of self-contentment appears from the context as well as from the very circumstantial additions "in everything" and "at all times." One is tempted to believe that St. Paul had some knowledge of the Ethics of Aristotle, which is, in itself, far from improbable and it is curious that this Epistle was written from a country in which Aristotle had resided seven years. The adjective 'self-sufficient' (αὐταρκής) also is used in a letter written to Macedonians (Phil. iv. 11) and occurs there only in the N. T.

9. God *can* provide abundantly for givers, and that He *actually does* so is now shewn by scripture. It is said of the man that feareth the Lord (Ps. cxii. 9):—"**He scattered, he gave** to the poor." "Scattered" denotes, not without reference to sowing, liberal giving in many directions. "To the poor" shows that the giving discriminates its proper objects. The original for "poor" occurs here only in the N. T. and that in a quotation. It signifies merely one who is destitute of means and, as such destitution is by itself a sufficient ground for charitable help, the term is in its right place here. The regular word for 'poor' in the N. T. denotes one who feels his poverty. The abiding of righteousness for ever is God's reward for scattering. Under a legal dispensation, justice, which is obedience to law, or righteousness, as δικαιοσύνη is usually rendered, was the summary of all goodness and holiness. It was not unnatural that beneficence, the most helpful and popular form of goodness, should appropriate the general name. The LXX. often render the Hebrew equivalent for 'justice' or 'righteousness' by the Greek equivalent for 'alms.' (cf. Matt. vi. 1). That righteousness in Ps. cxii. (cxi. in the LXX.), signifies almsgiving, implying both the means and the will to give, is quite apparent from the context of the Psalm. A promise is given of earthly substance and power as a divine requital of liberality to the needy and as furnishing the ability to continue it through the God-fearing man's future generations. Cf. Isaiah xxxii. 1.

10. God who *can* and *does* thus bless charitable giving, *will* do so in the case of the Corinthians. "But he who **plentifully furnisheth** seed to the sower and bread **for eating** (Is. lv. 10) **will furnish** and multiply your seed and **will** increase the fruits of your righteousness." This designation of God amounts to an argument from analogy, and from the less to the greater. He who in the natural economy of the world supplies seed to the sower and bread, as its fruit, for the support of life, will, in his moral economy, likewise requite those who till the soil and sow the seed of charity. "The fruits of your righteousness" might mean, so far as the expression is concerned, only the earthly goods which are the requital of the righteousness, but the increase of these is already implied in the multiplication of the seed.

11. States an accompanying circumstance, which shows how and why the fruits of righteousness will be increased. "Whilst ye are enriched in everything to all **singlemindedness**." The construction of the original is irregular, but the sense clear. The "ye" takes up the "your" of the last verse. By the fulfilment of the promise just

Digitized by Google

12 For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God;

13 Whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for *your* liberal distribution unto them, and unto all *men*;

---

given they are enriched in every kind and particular (ἐν παντί) of worldly possessions, in order that they may exercise a single-mindedness, which keeps its gaze undistracted by selfish considerations and fixed solely on doing good to the poorer brethren, and which is ready to manifest itself on all occasions, in all ways, and to all suitable objects (πᾶσαν). Active charity and worldly substance grow by acting and reacting on each other. The Apostle, bringing his subject to a close, glides suddenly but naturally to the Godward side of the consequences of charity, by stating why God supplies substance for the exercise of *single-mindedness*. The force of the original for "which" is "because it," i.e. single-mindedness, "**worketh** through **us thanksgiving to God**" or "for God." When men through the agency of God's ministers, by a right use of previous gifts, themselves thankfully receive God's further gifts, and again, in imitation of His bounty, use them for the good of others, so that these recipients also thank God for the benefaction, it is, as far as it goes, the re-establishment of the right relation between God and men, and men and men.

**12.** But the deep religious significance of the collection cannot be dismissed in a single sentence. Its chief value consisted in its spiritual results, so he impresses upon his readers that the immediate end attained by the work of charity, the supplying of the wants of the saints, however excellent, is not its only one, and then reiterates in a fuller form what he had said about the more excellent fruit of thanksgiving. "For the ministering of this service **is not only an additional filling up of the lackings of the saints, but also a superabounding through the thanksgivings of many to God.**" The ministering here is not St. Paul's, but that of the contributors, as in viii 4; ix. 1. The saints had aid from other quarters; this was an additional help. The construction of the original, that of an auxiliary verb and a participle, seems to describe what the collection is in its nature, rather than merely what it does. It is not quite clear whether the connection is 'a superabounding to God' or 'thanksgivings to God,' for there is a relation between "the lackings of the saints" and 'thanksgivings to God,' as well as between 'a filling up for the saints' and 'a superabounding to' or 'for God.' The difference between a mere "filling up" and "a superabounding," or 'overflowing' intimates that the Apostle attached greater weight to the Godward than to the human side of the charity. The Greek term for "service," which furnishes us with the word 'liturgy originated at Athens, where it denoted certain expensive duties rendered by individuals to the state at their own cost (v. 10). It may possibly have been used by the Corinthians in the same sense, and it was, at any rate, quite familiar to them. In itself it denotes nothing more than a public service, but when it was applied to things Jewish, as the services of tabernacle or temple (see Grimm, Lex s. v.) or to things Christian, as here, it assumed a sacred sense, because it had reference in both cases to a holy community. It involves therefore the ideas of the public and the holy character of the service, and cannot be reproduced by a single English word.

**13.** States the means by which the thanksgivings are produced, and assigns two grounds for them. "**While through the approvedness of this ministry** they (the thanksgivers) glorify God." This is not the approvedness of the Corinthians established and attested by the collection, but the collection itself is regarded as a matter which had been upon its probation, as it had most truly been, and the Apostle here assumes that it has come honourably out of the ordeal. The assumption is a hint that the readers should take care to bring it out of its trial in such a form that it should be an occasion of glorifying God. The first ground upon which this glorifying would be based is expressed in a difficult sentence involving some grammatical questions, which may be seen discussed in Osiander, Meyer or Klöpper. "**Upon the subjection of your confession** to the Gospel of Christ." Some Jewish Christians at Jerusalem were not of opinion that the Churches founded by St. Paul confessed the same Gospel of Christ which they confessed themselves, and this view was studiously fostered by the Apostle's enemies. They thought also that his Gentile converts held the confession of Christianity to be compatible with a disregard not only of the Mosaic law, but of moral law generally. When to persons entertaining these notions a large bounty was presented from those about whom they entertained them, the reflection



Digitized by Google

14 And by their prayer for you, which long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you.

15 Thanks *be* unto God for his unspeakable gift.

---

would naturally suggest itself that the gift proceeded not from persons who deemed that they were subject to no practical obligations, but from men who fully recognised the cardinal law of love. Further, in considering what motive prompted the benefaction, they could scarcely come to any other conclusion than that it was the true sympathy of sincere men for those who hold the same religious convictions with themselves. The original for "confession" is not adequately rendered by its English representative. It denotes an agreement with persons and also a conformity of professed views and feelings either with facts, as when it is used for confession of sins, or with some other standard. The full drift probably is that the Jewish Christians would glorify God for the submission and conformity of the Corinthians both in their views of Christian truth and their sense of Christian obligations, to the same Gospel which they themselves professed. The words "to the Gospel of Christ" refer not to the subjection alone nor to the confession alone but to both together. The idea of *subjection* of a man's confession of faith to the Gospel is illustrated by x. 4, 5, "bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ," and also by Rom. vi. 17. The second ground for glorifying God is "**the single-mindedness of your communion to them and to all.**" Communion is the Christian fellowship which unites believers as brethren, and its single-mindedness consists in its being entertained without selfishness or narrowness. In the case before us it would be shewn not merely by liberality, but by the fact of heathens and particularly Greeks, with their strongly-marked national characteristics, so overcoming prejudices, antipathies, and idiosyncrasies, as to acknowledge a common bond of love with men of a nationality as strongly marked as their own but quite of an opposite cast. The contempt and aversion of Jew for Gentile was only equalled by that of Gentile for Jew. This collection was a concrete expression of Corinthian communion towards Jews only, but it was a sufficient earnest of a like communion with *all* believers. This second ground for glorifying God is the result of the first, viz. of a submissive confession of one and the same faith.

**14.** As the recipients could not be said to glorify God *on the ground* of their own intercessory prayer for the givers, this verse does not state a further ground, but the *mode* of glorification, and it is obvious that the prayer of brethren for brethren is as much a glorifying of God as thanksgiving itself. The Apostle attributes to the grateful Jewish Christians a feeling, prompting their prayer; "**while they** long after you," i.e. yearn for personal intercourse with you. He was probably thinking of a frequent interchange of communications through messengers and envoys. He wishes to impress his readers with the deep sincerity and the value of the prayer and to awaken in them a reciprocal interest. The reason of the longing was "the exceeding grace of God (resting) **upon** you." This grace would be inferred from the gift, and all that the gift implied, and it would be regarded as "exceeding" because the givers were *gentiles*. Perhaps the Apostle was also tacitly anticipating a liberal gift. All the happy results present themselves to the Apostle's mind as a whole, and elicit a final ejaculation of gratitude, which is a prelude to the thanksgivings hereafter to come from the many saints (v. 12). "Thanks be to God for his **indescribable** gift." This is too strong to refer merely to the collection, and to suppose that the "gift" is that of God's own Son (viii. 9), is too wide a deviation from the immediate context. The Apostle would have been bound to indicate such a meaning. He was perhaps chiefly contemplating the establishment of a universal brotherhood of mankind in Christ, of which this work was a prognostic and a partial realisation.

---

## Final Polemic and Warning addressed to the Judaizing Leaders and their Followers, and to the Heathen Sensualists at Corinth (x.—xiii.).

The third main section of the Epistle (x.-xiii.) undoubtedly bears the appearance of an annex, and its tone is in marked contrast with that of the preceding sections; conciliation and comparative calmness giving place to sarcasm, menace, and defiance. But St. Paul would have dealt with his situation very inadequately, had he been content merely to append to chap. ix. a

Digitized by Google

valedictory conclusion. He would have presented a very feeble front to the Judaizers, who, being organs of Satan, were doing their master's work upon the Church. The previous portion of the Epistle had little direct bearing upon them. They were beyond the reach of conviction, of exhortation, and even of charitable consideration. Of what avail was it, so far as they were concerned, to insist upon the spirituality of his gospel, to explain the true nature of the new ministry and of God's message of reconciliation through Christ, or in fact to reason with them at all? Why attempt to establish a good understanding with them? What they required was ruthless exposure, open war, and denunciation, and this is the treatment they receive in that portion of the closing chapters which has especial reference to them (x.–xii. 18). The new matter here adduced, itself shows how imperfectly St. Paul would have discharged his task, had it not been added. At the same time its solidarity with the first section of the Epistle is placed beyond all doubt, because, although these antagonists are there made to stand aside while the Apostle appeals (i.–vii.) to the main body of the Church with self-defence and gracious offers of reconciliation, which was much the most important object of his letter, there are unmistakable proofs of their presence. To say nothing of the accusations against him, which must have proceeded from them, we find overreaching plans of Satan to be guarded against (ii. 11); persons who are perishing, to whom the Gospel is an odour of death unto death (ii. 15), who adulterated God's word for gain (ii. 17), who brought letters of recommendation to Corinth (iii. 1), whose eyes the God of this world had blinded (iii. 11). See Introduction, pp. 384, 386. Besides these ringleaders, the Apostle, having with the aid of Titus and perhaps of Timothy analysed the community carefully and correctly, knew that there was another group also distinct from those to whom he speaks in chapters i.–ix. It was composed of men whom the ministers of Satan had in a considerable measure drawn under their influence and beguiled and who consequently were in great peril of making entire shipwreck of their salvation. These are they to whom chapters x.–xii. 18, are *directly* addressed, their seducers being mentioned only in the third person, as standing beyond the pale of the Church and constituting by themselves a synagogue of Satan. The Apostle still hopes that he may win back their victims from the abyss on the verge of which they are hovering, but he has great apprehensions (xi. 3), and the strain in which he reproaches, taunts, and warns them, although animated with affection, is essentially different from that of the earlier chapters (i.–vii.) addressed to the better disposed.

He was also far from having delivered his entire message upon the burning sore of immorality. See Introduction, pp. 377, 379. His farewell word about this is contained in the passage which extends from xii. 21 to xiii. 10. In the first section of the Epistle this evil is expressly dealt with in chapter vi., which plainly has in view only those whom an earnest, but at the same time calm and kind exhortation might be expected to check; persons who sinned from previous habit and from weakness. But as there was an extreme party of Judaizers, so was there of sensualists, which upon an Antinomian theory deliberately discarded moral obligations to purity, and was "puffed up" (1 Cor. v. 2) by the conduct of the great offender. For these the gentle admonition of chap. vi. was quite out of place. They brought shame upon the Christian profession and branded St. Paul's ministry with the stigma which, in the eyes of the Judaizers it richly deserved, as encouraging immoral excesses by setting aside the Law. These professed libertines also had their following of men who, prompted by evil inclination, had given ear to their reasonings and were in danger of making common cause, although they were not yet identified with them. This following also the Apostle seems to distinguish from its leaders in xiii. 2: "I write to those who have *sinned before* and *to all the rest!*" where however see the Note. There is even an appear-



Digitized by Google

ance of a disposition to mention these leaders like the Judaizers, only in the third person (xii. 21). Nevertheless he threatens *all* that are involved in immorality and recommends those of whom he has not lost all hope to test themselves whether they be in the faith (xiii. 5), even though he does suggest the terrible possibility that they may be reprobate. There is not a syllable in this strain in chap. vi., because he was there warning a different class, whereas he is now dealing with delinquents much more deeply involved in guilt whom it was impossible to leave unwarned.

The analysis of the final section is, according to the above remarks:—x.–xii. 18, against the Judaizers and their followers; xii. 19, 20, two verses of transition upon the general disorders of the Church xii. 19—xiii. 10 on immorality; xiii. 11, 12, 13, farewell greeting and benediction.

---

## CHAPTER X.

1 *Against the false apostles, who disgraced the weakness of his person and bodily presence, he setteth out the spiritual might and authority, with which he is armed against all adversary powers,* 7 *assuring them that at his coming he will be found as mighty in word, as he is now in writing being absent,* 12 *and withal taxing them for reaching out themselves beyond their compass, and vaunting themselves into other men's labours.*

NOW I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, who [1]in presence *am* base among you, but being absent am bold toward you:

2 But I beseech *you*, that I may not be bold when I am present with that confidence, wherewith I think to be bold against some, which [1]think of us as if we walked according to the flesh.

3 For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh:

[1] Or, *in outward appearance.*

[1] Or, *reckon.*

---

CHAP. X. 1. He addresses directly those who are under the influence of the Judaizers, and indirectly these false guides themselves, of whom he speaks in the third person, not regarding them as members of the community. "But I myself Paul exhort you." He appropriates, with fine irony, the character with which his Judaizing friends are kind enough to accredit him. 'I, in the very character attributed to me.' The reference is to the last words of the verse:—the very man "who in personal presence am **humble** among you but absent am bold towards you." Satisfied, for the moment, with this delineation of himself, he desires that it may continue always true, and that his readers may not give occasion, by their conduct, for his being the opposite of humble and meek when he comes again. He appeals to them therefore "through the meekness and goodness of Christ." Meekness deals gently with behaviour calculated to arouse indignation, and the original for goodness denotes that habit of mind which makes kindly allowance for wrong doing, and does not insist upon dealing with it according to the letter of the law (Aristot. Eth. Nic. vi. 11). The charge implied against him in the last words of the verse is more distinctly formulated in vv. 9, 10, and there is also an allusion to it in xiii. 3. See Introd. pp. 377, 378.

2. The substance of his exhortation he now gives in the stronger form of a prayer. "But" resumes 'I exhort,' in its altered form, and also slightly contrasts the courage, to which he begs that he may not have to resort when present with the courage attributed to him when absent. He "**counts**" to exercise a bold courage against "some," who "**count**" of him as walking according to the flesh, which they did by their imputation that he was afraid of offending heathen believers by strict discipline or that he courted popularity with them by over-leniency. His prayer is that those who follow such leaders may not constrain him to use the same courage towards them as he purposes using towards those who had led them astray.

3. The reason of his prayer and of his purposed manifestation of courage is that the estimate taken of him is false. That he walks "*in* the flesh" he allows. All men, even the regenerate, walk *in* the flesh. They are liable to be tempted by the flesh, and suffer from the weaknesses of the flesh. But the flesh is not in them the dominant power, and he denies therefore that his warfare is waged "*according to* the flesh." Infirmities of the flesh rendered his body a very imperfect organ for the exercise of spiritual powers and one which may at times have depressed his

Digitized by Google

4 (For the weapons of our warfare *are* not carnal, but mighty ‖through God to the pulling down of strong holds;)

5 Casting down ‖imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;

6 And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

7 Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man

‖ Or, *to God.*

‖ Or, *reasonings.*

---

energies; but that his ministerial strategy, his tactics in the discharge of his office were dictated by fear or desire of popularity or any such carnal principle is a calumny.

**4.** Of this the nature and the purpose of his weapons are the proof. They are "powerful **for** God to the pulling down of strongholds." "Powerful" is an offset against the weakness of the flesh. For the reason why God chooses weak instruments see iv. 7. But He always gives them the requisite "excess of power" over all opposition. In "the pulling down of strongholds," he regards Corinth as a citadei of truth, built by him in the territory originally assigned to him by God and appropriated by him, in fact, through spiritual conquest and occupation. In this district therefore no one had any right to operate except himself, but the Judaizers, not satisfied with their own province, which was, if anywhere, amongst the Jews, had invaded *his* and, having invested his central fortress in the absence of its commandant, they had thrown up siege-works and towers, which threatened its destruction. They had made overtures to the garrison, of which some had gone over, and were now playing the part of deserters under shelter of those strongholds which he threatens with overthrow. That the adversaries are regarded as besiegers in this figure appears from the next verse, where they are represented as operating against the knowledge of God, the seat of which could only be the Corinthian Church.

**5.** States how he, the commandant, on his return, intends to wield his weapons, and explains "strongholds." The connection, which is with the last and not with the third verse, is expressed by another of those irregular participial constructions which abound in this epistle. The strongholds are "**reasonings**, and every high structure **raised against** the knowledge of God." He means human theories and deductions, as opposed to the true knowledge of God which is based upon revelation and the teaching of the Spirit. From the tendencies of the Greek mind and from 1 Cor. i.—iii. the reference might seem to be to Philosophy. But the context points decisively to the Judaizers, and that they also had their elaborate arguments, by which they constructed a composite system out of the purely objective elements of the Gospel and the principles of the Mosaic law, in which the latter entirely preponderated, St. Paul's Epistles and the Clementine Homilies amply prove. The high structures are not identical with the reasonings, but are the towering arrogance and pretensions put forward in the endeavours to thrust St. Paul out of Corinth. "The knowledge of God" was the spiritual Gospel preached by him and designated in iv. 6. "The knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ." After the overthrow of the siege-works follows the "leading captive" of "every thought into the obedience to Christ." The thoughts are not those of the beleaguerers, for the context shews that the Apostle regarded *them* as reprobate, but those of the deserters from the garrison. When the works under shelter of which they now are shall have been pulled down, these runaways will be taken prisoners and their thoughts, temporarily decoyed into disloyalty, will be led back, like vanquished captives out of a rebellious district, and restored to the allegiance due to the true Christ. For the term "obedience" as applied to the thoughts, see ix. 13.

**6.** All will not be led into this happy captivity. Some will be too deep in defection to accept the gracious terms proposed. When the better-minded have, after surrender, been completely reconciled, he is ready to inflict full punishment upon the residuary recalcitrants. He leaves this painful part of his work to the last, so as to give the delinquents an ample locus poenitentiae. The penalty in his mind was probably a handing over to Satan whose service they refused to relinquish.

**7.** Endeavouring to effect his end before his visit, he delivers an assault at once upon one of the reasonings that most menaced the knowledge of God. He asks in surprise whether his readers regard merely external advantages destitute of all spiritual worth, such as his Judaizing enemies possessed. The specific point of their supposed superiority was the boast that they belonged to Christ in some special manner in which the Apostle did not. They had apparently known Christ

Digitized by Google

trust to himself that he is Christ's let him of himself think this again, that, as he *is* Christ's, even so *are* we Christ's.

8 For though I should boast somewhat more of our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed:

9 That I may not seem as if I would terrify you by letters.

10 For *his* letters, say they, *are* weighty and powerful; but *his* bodily presence *is* weak, and *his* speech contemptible.

11 Let such an one think this, that, such as we are in word by letters when we are absent, such

---

in the flesh, perhaps been disciples, possibly claimed the qualifications of Apostleship specified in Acts i. 21, 22. These claims of course could not have been advanced by all the Christ party, but the followers naturally took the designation of their chiefs. The Apostle however is speaking of the chiefs, and they thought, with the uttermost self-confidence, that their connection with Christ was enough without commission from Him or any one else, to constitute them Christ's ministers (xi. 23) and Apostles. They thought there was no true Apostleship without this connection and denied the Apostleship of Paul. He demands that, as they are so confident in themselves and their position, they should, per contra (πάλιν), of their own motion and without argument on his part, consider that he also must, in some sense or other, if not in theirs, belong to Christ. There is a vein of sarcasm in this. If *they*, without call or appointment, without recognition from the Twelve (Acts xv. 25), without compact (Gal. ii. 9) with them, without any great creative work to attest their Apostleship, were nevertheless so sure that they were Christ's ministers, could they not at once discern that *he*, qualified in all these ways, was also a minister of Christ? But this, once admitted, involved great consequences, because his bond with Christ was wholly different from theirs and was, in fact, the basis both of his spiritual Gospel and his spiritual ministry.

**8.** A proof, stated hypothetically, of his belonging to Christ is that, if he should put forth higher claims about the authority and power committed to him, and utter more formidable disciplinary threats than he has either here, in vv. 4, 5, 6, or in the letters in which he was said to have displayed his paper-courage, he would not be put to shame by any facts showing his words to be empty boasts; but would be able so to substantiate them, as to leave no doubt as to the validity of his office. The language in which he describes his power involves the reason why he abstains from thus asserting it. The right use of it was to found, rear, and restore, and to work of that kind he could appeal over a vast area. But to fulminate and execute severities, as some would have him do (ii. 11), would be to follow the example of his antagonists, whose work was the antithesis of his, being constructive of Satanic strongholds, destructive of the Temple of God; while his was destructive of Satanic strongholds, constructive of the Church of Christ. He does not mean that he will not punish at all; but his chastisement itself would be for the general good, and for the salvation of those who suffered it (1 Cor. v. 5).

**9, 10.** The object of his reticence is:—"in order that I may not seem, **as it were, to** terrify you through my letters." The ground of this sarcastic allusion is that he had been accused of such terrorism. The letters meant are, of course, those only which he had written to the Corinthians. The weighty and strong passages in them were those in which he denounced heathen immoralities, as we know that he did in all the Corinthian letters. Whether the taunt about the presence of his person referred at all to his unimposing bodily appearance, resulting from persecutions and hardships, which left upon him "the marks of the Lord Jesus," is very doubtful. See Introduction, p. 378. The contemptuous disregard of his word was the perseverance of the heathen believers in their excesses.

N.B. For a good note on the rendering "**as it were**" for ὡς ἄν, see Butt. N. T. Gram. p. 189. The single word of the original, rendered in the A.V. 'they say,' is a semi-impersonal use of the Greek equivalent for 'says.' It resembles the French 'on dit,' and the German 'man sagt.' Its literal force is apparently 'says this, that, or the other person,' but it is rightly translated "they say" in the current and vague sense of that phrase. The true reading, however, is the singular φησί, and not the plural φασί. But it is a mistake to suppose that the singular implies a reference to any *individual* critic of the Apostle's letters.

**11.** Suggests to any one who passes such criticisms upon him, to consider *this*:—that "such as we are in our word through letters

Digitized by Google

*will we be* also in deed when we are present.

12 For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, [1]are not wise.

[1] Or, *understand it not*.

13 But we will not boast of things without *our* measure, but according to the measure of the [1]rule which God hath distributed to us, a measure to reach even unto you.

[1] Or, *line*.

14 For we stretch not ourselves beyond *our measure*, as though we reached not unto you: for we are

---

when absent, such (are we), also when present, in our deed." This is again a simple appeal to the work achieved by him in founding and building up such a Church as that of Corinth. Had he not been weighty and energetic in personal presence, that Church could not have existed. Its existence is the solid monument of his strength, and to this kind of proof alone will he point. The sense might indeed be that his adversaries may count upon his shewing the same energy in administering discipline when present, that he has confessedly shewn in his letters, but it is less favoured by the context.

**12.** He assigns the reason why he thus confines himself to the logic of facts, in a strain of sharp irony. One kind of courage he *does* lack. "For we have not the boldness **to pair or compare** ourselves with **some of those that** commend themselves." The Corinthian church is his commendatory letter (iii. 2). His enemies, having no such letter, are driven to commend themselves. To rank himself with them or compete with them in this respect, demands a kind of courage which he does not possess. The word above rendered "to pair with," means to 'rate' or 'estimate amongst,' and is so rendered in order to reproduce a play upon words in the original, which materially helps the sarcasm. "But," while we thus refrain, "they" on the contrary, in complete self-reliance (αὐτοί), "measuring themselves among themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves, do not understand." In settling the extent to which they are competent to carry their operations, as supposed ministers of the Gospel, they are guided by no other tests or landmarks than those which they choose to set up among themselves, and, in appraising their own value, they refer themselves to no objective standard but regard merely the advantages and claims to distinction, which they imagine to attach to their own persons, such as are specified in xi. 21, 22, and elsewhere. "Measuring themselves" and "comparing themselves," refer to two different things. The former seems, at first sight, to denote taking a self-estimate of personal worth. But vv. 13, 14 show distinctly that the Apostle is speaking of the sphere of action which these persons thought themselves entitled and fitted to fill. The scope of his own commission, and the allotment of his spiritual work, were expressly assigned by God and acknowledged by the original Apostles. The intruders had taken their own dimensions and laid themselves out for a region to which they were incommensurate. "Comparing themselves with themselves" describes the method which they pursued in rating their personal worth. They adopted no standard appointed by God, or Christ, or the Gospel, or the Church, or by any other authority independent of themselves. They were their own models of excellence. The Greek carries the two ideas of reciprocal exaltation and self-exaltation, and, no doubt, these persons practised both. They were a mutual-admiration and a self-admiration society. The Apostle contents himself with the criticism, "they do not understand," which is tame in sound, but contains a latent sting: 'they are not intelligent.' If it is not ironical, it means that their self-measurements and self-comparisons had only blinded their understandings as to the true qualifications of an Apostle.

**13.** The result was that they set no limits either to their worth or their range of action. But he will not boast ad infinitum, "**beyond all bounds.**" With εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα, which might however bear the sense given to it in the A.V., compare such expressions as εἰς τὰ μάλιστα. He on his part will only assert himself with regard to his ministerial sphere, "according to the measure **of the defined space, which God apportioned to him as a measure,**" i.e. for the express purpose of its serving as a rule for marking out his field of operations. But as God had assigned to him the *whole* of heathendom, his proper region was such as "to reach as far as you also." Omne majus continet minus. The original for "**defined space,**" is a word naturalised in English, "canon," which, meaning properly a measuring instrument, is transferred to that which is measured by it, just as the Canon of Scripture is the body of sacred literature determined according to a certain rule or test.

**14.** Applies more closely the statement

Digitized by Google

come as far as to you also in *preaching* the gospel of Christ:

15 Not boasting of things without *our* measure, *that is*, of other men's labours; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be [1]enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly,

[1] Or, *magnified in you.*

16 To preach the gospel in the *regions* beyond you, *and* not to boast in another man's [1]line of things made ready to our hand.

[1] Or, *rule.*

17 [d]But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

[d] Jer. 9. 24. 1 Cor. 1. 31.

18 For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth.

---

that he will not boast beyond bounds, though he does assert his claim upon Corinth, and adduces an accomplished fact as confirmation. "For we do not, as though we were persons not reaching to you, **over-extend** ourselves, for as far as you also we **forestalled** (others) in the Gospel of Christ." The idea involved in over-extension of self is, as in v. 12, that of a commensurateness between the person and the place which he holds, such as exists between a man and a fitting garment. If any one wishing to be great, undertakes a province, which he cannot fill, he over-measures or over-extends himself. This was not the case with the Apostle, for God gave him his province and he filled the Corinthian district of it, having taken possession before any one else had set foot in it.

15. Expands his denial of over-extension of self, in pointed contrast to the conduct of his adversaries. "Not boasting **beyond all bounds in other men's labours.**" His principle was not to preach where others had preached before him, nor build upon another man's foundation (Rom. xv. 20). His enemies spoke and acted as if the fruits of his missionary toil had been produced by them. Against this lawless and vaulting ambition he sets his own most legitimate aspirations. "But having hope, **as your faith grows, to be magnified,**" or "**to attain increased stature** among you, in accordance **with our defined space** superabundantly," or "to an overgrowing." As opposed to a false over-extension of self, he hopes for a real growth to an excess of stature amongst the Corinthians. This growth of *his* depends upon the growth of *their* faith, which ought by this time to have been full and ripening. But the agents of Satan had sowed tares and impeded it. Pari passu with the progress of a new wholesome upshooting, his own Apostolic authority and influence would also advance and would not only fill the whole space of Corinth and Achaia but would over-extend it. He would be enabled to carry his missionary labours to still remoter regions, which would nevertheless, according to the wide terms of his original commission, be "in accordance with his defined space." This anticipation was happily fulfilled, for we find him saying in Rom. xv. 22, that he has "no more place in these regions," i.e. in Achaia, which he had filled.

16. The purpose or result of his overgrowing Achaia. The further countries which he had in view were Rome and Spain (Rom. xv. 22), and, if between writing this Epistle and that to the Romans, he visited Illyricum, he was also thinking of western Greece. Rom. xv. 19. In contrast with this lawful expansion of his work, he aims another side-blow at his opponents, by pointing out a consequence that will not follow, viz., that of boasting over *work ready done* in the space meted out to others. The countries he was contemplating were not yet evangelised. Christianity had made its way to Rome (Rom. i. 14, 15); but had plainly not been preached there by any Apostle. The unqualified tone in which he speaks in Rom. i. 14, 15, renders it very improbable that he is thinking, in v. 15 of this chapter, when he talks of "getting his stature increased," of obtaining a new concordat with the original Apostles similar to that of Gal. ii. 9, which should authorise him to embrace these new districts within his 'rule.' He could not now have deemed such a step necessary and, in fact, the original contract, which he had never violated, was perfectly general in its terms and still valid.

17. The rule of true boasting from Jer. xi. 23, which applies to him as well as to his enemies; only, while they do not observe it, he does. Its purport is that, whenever it is necessary to assert your work, powers, or claims before men, you should refer them all to their true source, which is God, as he invariably does. In v. 8 he ascribes his power to Christ, and in v. 13 the limits within which he boasts to God, whom, as in the Prophet, the title 'Lord' here designates, and not the Saviour.

18. Negative and positive foundation of the rule just cited: God commended him by the wide and continued successes of his work, and therefore guaranteed him to the world as a true Apostle. His antagonists, having no such successes, but being only self-commenders, remained unapproved.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER XI.

1 *Out of his jealousy over the Corinthians, who seemed to make more account of the false apostles than of him, he entereth into a forced commendation of himself,* 5 *of his equality with the chief apostles,* 7 *of his preaching the gospel to them freely, and without any their charge,* 13 *shewing that he was not inferior to those deceitful workers in any legal prerogative,* 23 *and in the service of Christ, and in all kind of sufferings for his ministry, far superior.*

WOULD to God ye could bear with me a little in *my* folly: and indeed [1] bear with me.

2 For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present *you as* a chaste virgin to Christ.

3 But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be

[1] Or, *you do bear with me.*

---

CHAP. XI. Men are apt to be rated at the value which they put upon themselves, and the self-glorification of the false teachers had imposed upon ordinary minds in Corinth. The Apostle sees no more effectual means of counteraction than that of adopting for a moment the tactics of his adversaries. He descends into the lists of boasting and competes with them on their own ground. But after so strongly condemning self-commendation, he can only do this on understood conditions. It is a proceeding in which he must desire to be tolerated; it is folly (xi. 1); an imitation, not to say parody of an example already set and allowed (xi. 18); a course to which his readers have compelled him (xii. 11); it is not speaking according to the Lord (xi. 17); it is boasting of infirmities (xi. 30) and not of things upon which a man could really pride himself; it is not expedient for him (xii. 1). Notwithstanding all this it is a masterly stroke, for it thoroughly exposes the inanity of his antagonists' pretensions and reminds his readers of many truths about himself which they ought never to have forgotten.

1. The first four verses are introductory. "Would that **ye tolerated me in a little somewhat of folly!**" Where his adversaries had been tolerated in much folly, he speaks in mingled satire and sadness, as if he were not tolerated in a little. But instantly correcting himself, he adds:—"**but ye do tolerate me,**" which assumption is again a delicate blending of irony and affection. It is like a father telling an erring son that he is sure of his sufferance in recounting to him the proofs of his love and opening his arms to welcome him back.

2. It is however a peculiar love upon which his assurance is based. It is the anxious attachment of one who dreads that the object of his love may prove inconstant, which serves also as an apology for his folly, for 'amantes videntur amentes.' At the same time it is not a mean or merely human jealousy, but "**God's jealousy,**" and this constitutes a further plea for patient hearing. In the Old Testament the marriage-tie represents the holiness and closeness of the bond between God and his people. In the New Testament the *spiritual* Israel is the betrothed, and Christ, the incarnate God, is the Bridegroom. "For I **betrothed** you to one husband, **to** present you a pure virgin to Christ." What John the Baptist was to the Saviour before His first coming, the Apostle is before His second, the Friend of the Bridegroom. This intermediary made the first overtures, was the channel of communication between the engaged parties, arranged the preliminaries of the marriage and presented the bride to the bridegroom on the wedding day. The Apostle's office therefore would only terminate with the presentation of the church at the marriage of the Lamb, until which great day his responsibility as custodian of the Bride remains. When there is a possibility of unfaithfulness he shares the jealousy of the Bridegroom, which is also that of God, who makes the marriage feast for His Son.

3. The apprehension which causes the jealousy is placed in antithesis to the object of his office as Bridegroom's Friend. "But I fear lest perchance, as the serpent **succeeded in beguiling** Eve in his wicked cunning, so your **thoughts** should be corrupted from **your singlemindedness to** Christ." In this comparison the two cases are *identical* so far as the tempter, Satan, and his general method of wicked subtlety are concerned; analogous with regard to the instrumentality used and the particular form of the subtlety. The agency was in the one case, that of the serpent, "more subtle than any beast of the field" (Gen. iii. 1); in the other that of the Judaizers, "crafty workers (v. 13), ministers of Satan" (v. 15). In the one case the appeal was to a desire of the flesh (Gen. iii. 6) with a falsehood about God and His word, and the promise of a superiority of knowledge and position to be gained by disobedience; in the other to carnal Jewish prejudices with a perverted Gospel and the offer of a "Christ according to the flesh." The Judaizers asserted also that their Gospel furnished the

Digitized by Google

corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.

4 For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or *if* ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with *him*.

5 For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.

6 But though *I be* rude in speech,

---

true knowledge of God and Christ and that in the Christ preached by them the Jews had a prerogative claim superior to that of the Gentiles. St. Paul expresses his fear about the success of this seductive wooing in a manner which shews his great anxiety, but he abstains from the charge that his readers had actually yielded. The conceptions which the Church entertained of the true Christ are very suitably called her "thoughts" about the Bridegroom, and these would be corrupted and alienated from (φθαρῇ ἀπό) their undivided integrity of love, if there were substituded for Him a Christ according to the flesh. The comparison of the Church to Eve involves, as in iv. 16, the analogy between the natural and spiritual creations in each of which Satan played his part of adversary.

**4.** The reason of his apprehension. "For if indeed **the comer** preaches another Jesus, whom we **did** not **preach**, or ye take a **different** spirit, which ye did not take, or a different Gospel, which ye did not receive, ye **were doing finely in tolerating** (him)." Caustic satire and reproach. The deceivers are designated by an obnoxious characteristic of their class and by a term in the singular number, one of them being taken as a representative of his tribe, just as we might say 'the Englishman' for the whole nation without pointing to a particular individual any more than St. Paul does here. See Winer, 104; Butt. N. T. Gr. 253. "**The comer**" describes the false teachers as adventitious, a foreign and intrusive element. It may also mark the vast importance which they claimed. They were the 'coming men' as though St. Paul had been only their humble forerunner. The context, not the original form of expression, shews that the Apostle considered what he puts hypothetically to be actually going on. Jesus preached by the Judaizers was so different from the Jesus of St. Paul, that he is called another. See ch. iii. and v. 16. Introd. p. 385. From their preaching his readers took or 'caught' a spirit different in kind, from that which they took from his, i.e. a spirit of fear and bondage (Rom. viii. 16), instead of a spirit of liberty and adoption (iii. 17). They took also a Gospel of a radically different character from that which they "received "from him, for the glad tidings of free salvation, justification by faith, and sanctification by the spirit, were cancelled if men still had to be saved by imitating Christ's obedience to the law. From a different Christology followed a different theory of salvation. The A. V. endeavours to reproduce the distinction between the words, used in the original (λαμβάνειν and δέχεσθαι) for 'take' and 'receive,' by rendering them 'receive' and 'accept.' The former (λαμβάνειν) does not imply a giver nor necessarily a distinct concurrence of the will, which the latter (δέχεσθαι) does. If this is what is taking palce at Corinth, "Ye were doing finely," he says, "in your toleration." It was so obvious an approximation to disloyalty to their first faith and love, a consummation by flesh of an initiation by spirit (Gal. iii. 3), that he cannot suppress this cutting reflection. He represents the toleration as a thing going on in past time, because he had in his mind the favourable report of Titus, and this spared him the pain of speaking as if it were continuing still. The A. V. assumes that the particle ἄν is to be supplied, but that is not possible, and if it were so it would only help to take the edge off the sarcasm. The 'indeed' (μέν) at the beginning of the verse makes a little difficulty. It suggests that a slightly antithetical apodosis is coming, which does not come. He possibly altered the form of his idea. If not, and if he really intended the isolated μέν, the sense perhaps is:—'if what I hear is *indeed* true.'

**5.** His boasting now begins. They should not have tolerated:—"for I reckon that I **am** in nothing behind **the superlative** (or **superexcellent** or **transcendent**) Apostles!" It is difficult to reproduce the original exactly. It means that these men quite over-acted their assumed Apostolic part. He is not seriously comparing himself with them, but speaking with incisive bitterness of the supposed position of inferiority which they had tried to assign him. The notion that by these persons any of the original twelve are meant is a sheer figment. See Introduction, pp. 386, 387.

**6.** He allows one adverse criticism. He is untrained in speech, but that is more than compensated by the fact that he is not so in knowledge. Deficient in the unessential, the artistic skill to convey his teaching in an attractive rhetorical form, he is not lacking

Digitized by Google

yet not in knowledge; but we have been throughly made manifest among you in all things.

7 Have I committed an offence in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely?

8 I robbed other churches, taking wages *of them*, to do you service.

9 And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man: for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied: and in all *things* I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and *so* will I keep *myself*.

10 As the truth of Christ is in

in the essential, a full acquaintance with the truth to be conveyed. The drawback acknowledged attached to him in common with the other Apostles (Acts iv. 13), but it was more conspicuous in him perhaps because of the superabundance of his *new* revelations, and the depth of laborious thought requisite to mould them into the organic whole which constitutes his Gospel. Language was a weak vehicle for these mysteries and their mutual relations. The defect which he acknowledges is illustrated by his letters, notwithstanding their amazing force and characteristic eloquence, and it was probably more apparent in his personal addresses than in his writings. He had been contrasted at Corinth with the accomplished Apollos. See 1 Cor. i. 17; ii. 4, 13 and cf. iv. 7. The apprehension of v. 3 seems to intimate that his adversaries had considerable persuasiveness of speech and there are independent proofs that the class to which they belonged contained men of no ordinary ability.

It is not clear whether the words rendered in the A.V., "thoroughly . . . in all things," mean "in everything . . . among all," or "in everything . . . in all details" or "particulars." The drift is, in any case, that he and his fellow-labourers had, by their conduct in Corinth, been fully made known in their relation to the readers in all things, knowledge included, and so the judgment might be left to themselves.

N. B. The well-supported and more difficult reading φανερώσαντες would apparently restrict the manifestation to the knowledge.

**7.** In all things—or was there anything in which this was not so? In one matter he had, after his Master's example (viii. 9), shown his humility, but it had been turned against him. It was his gratuitous preaching (Introd. p. 386), and this point occupies him to the end of v. 12. When the object was that they might be exalted from the depths of heathenism to the heights of Christianity or from the yoke of the Law to the liberty of God's sons, his converts were the last who should answer this question in the affirmative. Christ's pure Gospel without price and the corrupted doctrine of the Judaizers at a cost (xi. 20); his self-abasement and their self-glorification; his emancipation and their enslaving of the community, are pointed contrasts.

**8, 9.** He had committed the sacrilege of pillaging other churches in taking pay for his services as a spiritual warrior (for ὀψώνιον in this sense see 1 Cor. ix. 7), in order to have funds for his "**ministry to**" the Corinthians. Calvin thinks the idea is that of taking legitimate spoils from the communities which he has conquered by converting them. But "plundered" suits the warmth of wounded feelings, and perhaps hints that the poor Macedonian churches which had subsidised him had felt the drain; a rather sharp sting for his well-to-do readers. He had brought funds with him on his first visit to Corinth, but they had run out (ὑστερηθείς, aor. "having *fallen* short"), his handicraft and the narrow margin of time which was all that he could devote to it not sufficing for his support. Still, he did not become a paralysing burden, a dead benumbing weight (κατενάρκησα, xii. 13) to any one. For the same givers recruited his empty exchequer with *supplementary* funds (προσανεπλήρωσαν), i.e. supplementary to those which they had previously supplied, not to the insufficient pittance gained by his manual labour, for, if the arrival of the brethren is that of Silas and Timothy (Acts xviii. 5), it is more likely that he had had no time for labour, because they found him in a state of close preoccupation of spirit with his ministerial work (Acts xviii. 5). Whether this bounty is alluded to in Phil. iv. 16 is doubtful. Not only with regard to money, but "in every thing," as, for instance, food, raiment, and lodging he had kept and means on his forthcoming visit still to keep himself from becoming a burden.

**10.** And this principle of action is so important to him that he avers, in the form of an adjuration, his purpose of maintaining it inviolate. As by His Spirit Christ Himself (Gal. ii. 20), Christ's mind (1 Cor. ii. 6), Christ's heart (Phil. i. 8, σπλάγχνα, A.V., *bowels*) is in him, so also is His truth or truthfulness. The figure in the latter part

Digitized by Google

[1] Gr. *this boasting shall not be stopped in me.*

me, [1]no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia.

11 Wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth.

12 But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.

13 For such *are* false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.

14 And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.

15 Therefore *it is* no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness;

---

of the verse (φραγησεται, not σφραγίσεται) may be either that of damming up water so as to hinder its free course or barricading a road or stopping a mouth. The original word is used in this last sense in Rom. iii. 19, and it yields a good meaning here, "This boasting **shall not be gagged with regard to me.**" The boasting is half personified and the reference of it to himself, as well as the passive form, indicates his hope that the boasting will not be left entirely to him but be made by others for him. His specific mention of "the regions of Achaia" seems to imply that adhesion to his self-denying ordinance was peculiarly necessary in that province and its capital. In trading and wealthy societies, where gain is the great end and more or less chicanery inevitable, there is a greater liability to the suspicion of a love of lucre, and money is more highly prized than in simpler and poorer communities. He goes so far as to say in 1 Cor. ix. 15 that it were better for him to die than to lose the glory of gratuitous preaching.

**11, 12.** The motive disclaimed may have been imputed to him or he may have thought that some of his readers might suspect it and feel hurt. His real motive is twofold. The Judaizers smarted under the reproach which his refusal of support reflected upon them, and they tried to provoke him out of it by the taunt that he declined to use an Apostle's prerogative (1 Cor. ix. 13) because he distrusted his Apostleship. But if they calumniated his abstinence, how much more, if he deviated from it, would they calumniate him for rapacity? They would then obtain the handle against him which they desire, but shall not have. They did accuse him and his colleagues of mal-appropriation (xii. 14–18). They boasted too of their own unselfishness but their practice contradicted their profession (ii. 17; xi. 20). They did not receive money or goods openly but they did so in secret. "They did not take, in order that they might take the more." He is resolved that his example shall constrain them to desist from this clandestine spoliation and be like himself. Herein appears the hypocritical villany which he now proceeds to denounce.

**13.** What the last verse implies with regard to his adversaries and states with regard to his own objects is not without ground. For men of such motives and conduct as he has just indicated are spurious Apostles usurping the title, authority, functions, and privileges, without the call, the mission, or the qualifications. It followed that they were deceitful workers (ἐργάται) in God's vineyard because they could only maintain their false position by imposture. In order that their true character might not be detected they resorted to disguise and transfigured their outward semblance into that of Apostles by assuming the name, the mask, and the habit.

**14.** These dark touches might be thought by those who had given ear to the deceivers whom they depict too strong for truth. Not so. They are to the life:—"no marvel, for Satan himself **changes his form into** (that of) **an angel of light.**" If the lord does this, it is natural that his servants should follow his example, using his power and imitating his wicked skill. "Like master, like man." Again, if the Prince of Darkness can stride over the vast gulf which separates his real nature from the outward appearance of an angel of light, his agents can step over the narrower chasm which divides them from Apostles of Christ. What makes the dividing space less in the latter case than it is in the former, is that beings of darkness and beings of light are opposites, whereas human beings are capable of living and moving in either region, darkness or light. They are flexible to either element, although they cannot belong to both at the same time. Satan, who is "the ape of God," counterfeits the Divine, and his strategy is a terrible caricature of the Almighty's ordinances. Whether St. Paul here ascribes to Satan a power of physical metamorphosis, by which he can assume at will false forms visible or seemingly visible to the eye, is doubtful. Such a power is conceivable, but the passages cited from the O.T. in support of it furnish inadequate illustrations (Gen. iii.; Job i.; 1 Kings xxii. 19). The strongest instance is the Lord's Temptation. The extracts adduced from Rabbinical literature to show that the notion

Digitized by Google

whose end shall be according to their works.

16 I say again, Let no man think me a fool; if otherwise, yet as a fool [1]receive me, that I may boast myself a little.

[1] Or, *suffer*.

17 That which I speak, I speak *it* not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly, in this confidence of boasting.

18 Seeing that many glory after the flesh, I will glory also.

19 For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye *yourselves* are wise.

20 For ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour *you*,

---

had a place in Jewish theology or in the popular creed render little assistance. The view is not required for the Apostle's drift in this passage, which is clearly moral and spiritual and is rather clouded by it than elucidated. To draw explanation from so mysterious a region is, as has been said, like gathering light out of darkness. The literal interpretation is defended by many Roman Catholic expositors who appeal for proof to the lives of the saints.

**15.** The conclusion here drawn from the last verse naturally agrees in substance with the statement (v. 13) of which the same verse (14) assigned the reason, but is varied in form, in order to point the meaning more forcibly. No marvel, if the ministers of him whose nature and work is unrighteousness, who is the father of lies and hypocrisy, should mimic the exterior of persons whose character and work is righteousness. They simulated righteousness in their false boast of unselfishness (v. 12) to which there is clear allusion, but they doubtless boasted also of every form of righteousness which consisted in obedience to the law, asserting, as they did, that the righteousness of faith "without the law" (Rom. iii. 21) was only a pretext for the practice of iniquity, and that it made Christ "a minister of sin" (Gal. ii. 17). It cannot be supposed, with Meyer, that they pretended to be ministers of righteousness in St. Paul's sense. Their conduct presents itself to the Apostle as something deserving a direful retribution. Their professions are Apostolic, their deeds Satanic. Which will decide their ultimate fate? Their deeds. They will have their place with Satan and his angels (Matt. xxv. 41), with whom they have already cast in their lot (Phil. iii. 19). And the practical purport of this is not so much to console the pious (!), as Calvin says, but to deter the misguided.

**16.** As he is now advancing, after having asserted his claims on two points (vv. 6, 7), to what may be more properly called boasting (21–23), he inserts a further apologetic preface, strongly tinged with irony, which extends to the middle of v. 21. "Again, I say," refers to v. 1, where he also spoke of his boasting as folly. His desire for acceptance here is also an echo of his wish there. It matters not whether he is regarded as wise or foolish. His antagonists had made boasting and his readers had allowed it to be made the order of the day, and he requests only that he too should be permitted to comply a little with the fashion.

**17.** But he guards himself at all points. Feeling and meeting the possible objection that he was compromising Christ by boasting, he exempts his Master from the responsibility. What he was going to say was not "according to the (will of the) Lord"—not uttered by His direction or under the inspiration of His Spirit, but in folly—though only a quasi-folly, because committed "in this confidence of boasting" prevalent at Corinth, where it had become necessary to answer fools according to their folly. The words rendered "according to (the will of) the Lord" might mean "according to the spirit" or "temper of the Lord," who never boasted in this manner.

**18.** States explicitly the excuse first intimated. It is "because many boast according to the flesh, that I also will boast." The emphasis lies upon the reason. The words "according to the flesh" shew how such boasting cannot be "according to the will of the Lord," and that he requires some apology for resorting to it. They prepare his readers also for the carnal strain which he is about to adopt; carnal only because the things which were boasted of are external and circumstantial, such as Hebrew descent for instance (vv. 22, 23).

**19.** The encouragement which he has to commit folly is the pleasure which he says derisively his readers in their wisdom take in the toleration of fools. See 1 Cor. iv. 10. It was a pleasant exercise of the superiority with which they accredited themselves.

**20.** The extent to which their sufferance had gone could be accounted for in no other way, and a fine spectacle it presented. Christ's freemen endured a tyranny which made them abject (καταδουλοῖ) slaves (Gal. ii. 4; v. 1, 13); a rapacity which devoured their substance; a wicked craftiness which took them in snares (λαμβάνει, xii. 6; Luke v. 5); an inflated and over-extended self-exaltation (x. 14—xi. 4); a

Digitized by Google

if a man take *of you*, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face.

21 I speak as concerning reproach, as though we had been weak. Howbeit whereinsoever any is bold, (I speak foolishly,) I am bold also.

22 Are they Hebrews? so *am* I. Are they Israelites? so *am* I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so *am* I.

23 Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I *am* more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft.

---

harsh treatment involving personal violence. It is probable that this last refers to some case in which brute force had been actually employed, if the very act described had not literally occurred (John xviii. 22; Acts xxiii. 2), perhaps under pretence of discipline.

21. **"I speak in a strain suitable to dishonour, on the ground you know that we proved weak."** He does not seek toleration (v. 16) for such exercise of power as he has just described, for he claims no such power, but speaks as becomes a person without position, rights, authority (ἄτιμος) accepting for himself and his colleagues the allegation made against him, on account of his feeble conduct on his second visit, that he was "weak" (x. 10). The tense of the original (aorist) shows that there is an allusion to that occasion, and a slight particle (ὡς) intimates that the weakness was one *imputed* to him by others. which idea may be expressed consistently with the biting irony of the passage, by the words "you know." The dishonour cannot possibly be that which attaches to the Corinthians for enduring the conduct of the Judaizers, because the mention of it would be quite superfluous after v. 20, and it would be out of all harmony with the sarcastic tone. **"Yet,"** though he claims no title to maltreat the community, and though he is called weak and speaks as one without rights (ἄτιμος) "in whatever anyone is bold (**it is folly that I speak**), **I also** am bold." Whatever grounds for daring pretensions his adversaries have he has as well as they. But remembering how worthless these grounds are, he interrupts himself to repeat that he speaks in folly.

22. The first of them concern Jewish extraction. They are stated in a rising scale, and may be described broadly as nationality, theocratic privileges, and the natural right of inheritance in the promises of the Messiah's kingdom. 'Hebrew,' a term of geographical origin denoting one of the trans-Euphratian stock to which Abraham belonged, distinguished the Jews and their language from foreign nations and tongues (Gen. xxxix. 14, 17; xli. 12; xliii. 32; Ex. i. 15, 16; &c., &c.). In later times it implied mainly birth in the holy land, adhesion to the national religion, usages, and traditions, knowledge of the ancient sacred language in which the Scriptures were written, and use of the popular Aramaic. 'Israelite' implied the participation in the signal blessings bestowed by God upon his elect people which St. Paul commemorates in connection with the name in Rom. ix. 4, 5, which passage the reader must consult. 'The seed of Abraham' was supposed to have an indefeasible claim (Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 39) to a share in the fulfilment of the great promise that in Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth (Gen. xii. 2 ff.; xiii. 15; xv. 5, 18; xviii. 18) should be blessed. When St. Paul's opponents claimed these designations in contrast with him they meant that by his birth at Tarsus, his Roman citizenship, his intercourse with the Gentiles, his mode of treating the Mosaic law, he had forfeited his nationality, his privileges, his natural right in the Messiah's kingdom. This is what he does not allow either here or in Rom. xi. 1 or Phil. iii. 5, 6. Upon the grounds stated in these passages and in Acts xxii. 3; xxiii. 6 he justly claims to stand, with regard to all the points in question, on the same level with his antagonists, although he attached a very different value to them.

23. The controversy, however, turned mainly upon their respective relations to Christ. On Jewish ground he claims equality; as a minister of Christ, superiority. "Ministers of Christ are they? I talk **in madness**; I am more." It does not materially affect the general drift, whether this be taken to mean that he is more a minister of Christ than they or that, if they are ministers of Christ, he is something beyond that. He does not concede that they *are* ministers of Christ (v. 15), but he takes them at their own valuation and speaks with an incisive irony which extends also to his madness. He knew his adversaries would say, in their blind arrogance, that it was a part of his habitual insanity (vi. 13) to set himself above them when he had in fact no true Apostleship at all. To substantiate his assertion that he is 'more,' he sketches in vivid detail a picture of his labours and sufferings, bodily and mental. The comparison between himself and them with reference to these conclusively shews how far they were from being ministers of Christ. They did *not* labour, but claimed

Digitized by Google

24 Of the Jews five times received I [a] forty *stripes* save one.

[a] Deut. 25. 3.

25 Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep;

26 *In* journeyings often, *in* perils of waters, *in* perils of robbers, *in*

---

the fruits of *his* labour (x. 15, 16) and, for a reason stated in Gal. vii. 12, they lacked while he had the indispensable sign of Apostleship foretold by Christ (Luke xxi. 12, 13), persecutions. See i. 4–10; iv. 7–16; vii. 4–10. The rush of his feelings over-rides exact construction in the first touches of the picture, but "In labours more **superabundantly**" is quite intelligible as it stands. If "more superabundantly" is a strict comparative, it means that his superabundance of labours is greater than theirs, and it would then be a covert taunt, because their superabundance of labours was none at all. In favour of taking it only as a strengthened positive is the simple word "often" at the end of the verse. The labours meant are the wearing toils of a missionary life (vi. 5). The stripes may either be the class of which he presently distinguishes two forms, or those which he received in popular uproars as distinguished from punishments at the hands of police. For imprisonments see vi. 5. The plural "deaths" denotes either the various forms in which death had impended or the many occasions on which he had been in articulo mortis.

**24.** Death leads him on to penal sufferings which were closely connected with death and execution (Matt. xxviii. 26) and in the infliction of which death itself sometimes actually occurred. He perhaps gives precedence to Jewish punishments because it was peculiarly galling to him to have been thus handled by his brethren according to the flesh whom he loved so fervently (Rom. ix. 2, 3), and because he would have escaped that treatment had he preached a Jewish Gospel. For scourging see Deut. xxv. 2; xxviii. 58 ff. The instrument used in later times is said to have resembled the Russian knout. The legal number of stripes was forty and the omission of one stripe was a precaution against violating the strict order (Deut. xxv. 3). Some think the scourge had three lashes and that thirteen strokes were administered. That St. Paul endured this penalty five times and yet lived is an illustration of his continual delivery over to death in order that the life of Christ might be manifested in his mortal flesh (iv. 11).

**25.** Beating with rods was the Roman punishment, inflicted with wands which were represented by the lictors' fasces. Only one of the three cases is recorded (Acts xvi. 22) in which Silas also suffered. The Apostle might have saved himself by pleading his Roman citizenship (Acts xxii. 25), but he probably preferred to share the lot of his colleague. The one instance of stoning took place at Lystra and at the instigation of Jews (Acts xiv. 19). Five sea-voyages, besides the last to Rome, are recorded in the Acts, in any one of which, supposing what is not likely, that they were all the Apostle made, one or more of these shipwrecks may have occurred. "A night and day have I passed in the deep." This must have befallen him in one of his shipwrecks, for context and language determine the deep to mean the sea. If the "in" were pressed it would indicate an experience like that of Jonah, but the expression need not mean more than that he had been driven about at sea on a raft or a fragment of wreck, or had been cast upon some rock ever and anon over-washed by the waves. The perfect tense adds to the vividness by placing the past in connection with the present and almost representing this experience as a characteristic of the Apostle. 'I am one who have passed.'

**26.** He reverts from particulars to generals and from verbs to substantives without the addition of the preposition 'in,' as in v. 23, for which therefore it is well to substitute 'by.' Such modifications are natural in a long catalogue, the items of which succeed one another in the rapid sweep of strong feeling, and they are not to be subjected too strictly to grammatical tests. His disasters by sea remind him of his journeys by land. The eightfold and emphatic reiteration of the word "perils" signifies that nowhere was he safe. The first two forms of peril are suggested by "journeyings." He had to wade, swim or cross rivers at the risk of life from shoals, rapids, whirlpools or floods. Robbers, like those on the road between Jerusalem and Jericho in the parable, abounded in Palestine, Syria and Asia Minor. For instances of danger at the hands of his own race, who hated him for his apostasy and his doctrine, see Acts xiii. 45, 50; xiv. 2, 5; xvii. 5, 13; xviii. 16; xix. 9; xxi. 27. It was not unusual for them to lie in wait for him in his journeys, and he doubtless had these cases particularly in his mind. The heathen were generally stirred up against him by Jews, as most of the references just given prove. The same insecurity of life attended him in all places inhabited or uninhabited, whether the wilderness of land or of water. For towns, as Damascus, Acts ix. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 32; Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 50; Iconium, xiv. 5; Lystra, xiv. 19;

Digitized by Google

perils by *mine own* countrymen, *in* perils by the heathen, *in* perils in the city, *in* perils in the wilderness, *in* perils in the sea, *in* perils among false brethren;

27 In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.

28 Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.

29 Who is weak, and I am not

---

Philippi, xvi. 19; Thessalonica, xvii. 5; Berea, xvii. 13; Corinth, xviii. 12; Ephesus, xix. 23. The perils in the wilderness might be from robbers, wild beasts, heat, winds, sands or uncertainty of roads. On sea the general dangers of which the cases mentioned in v. 25 are special instances. Perils amidst false brethren occupy the last place, because they were the most painful (Phil. iii. 18) and in a certain sense the greatest inasmuch as, under the mask of love, they came nearest to his person. He moved amongst (ἐν) them.

27. The current of his thoughts has carried him away into sufferings and perils, but he has not exhausted the exertions and trials which wasted his body. So he resumes them with two general words of which he had used one in v. 23 and recurring to the preposition "in" also used in v. 23. "**In toil and labour.**" The first of these, in the original, describes the physical wear and tear and weariness, the second the painful efforts of hard work. The two terms are found together in 1 Thess. ii. 19 and 2 Thess. iii. 8, and in both passages they refer to his handicraft. If that is their sense here, we must supply what is added in the two passages above referred to, that he pursued it by *night* as well as by day and so incurred the first of the privations which he proceeds to mention, want of sleep. He also sacrificed sleep for teaching and preaching, Acts xx. 31, as well as for prayer and meditation 1 Thess. iii. 10. The hunger and thirst meant were not endured in voluntary devotional exercises, but in famines, droughts, in the wilderness or at sea, or on long journeys. The fastings are abstinence practised when he preferred his ministerial labours to the satisfaction of his wants (vi. 5).

28. Of the many ways of interpreting this difficult verse the two which have most in their favour are: 1. "**Apart from**" or "**not to mention those things that there are besides,** (there is) **the daily onset upon me, the anxious** care for all the Churches." According to this the "things which are besides" are other hardships over and above those which he has enumerated and belonging to the same category, but which he abstains from specifying. He leaves the list of sufferings which come upon him from time to time incomplete, to mention one which presses upon him daily. 2. "**Apart from those things which there are besides,** viz., **the daily onset upon me, the anxious care for all the Churches.**" According to this "the things which there are besides" are the onset and the care, and the construction is not so much an irregular apposition of nominatives to a genitive, as an exclamatory mode of speaking, which causes the Apostle to throw in two nominative cases without any regular construction. See Butt. N. T. Gramm. p. 69. The onset is the continual resort and reference which parties and individuals made to him with their various difficulties, questions, wants, complaints. These he describes by a strong term which denotes a hostile insurrection or assault (ἐπισύστασις) which is applied in Numb. xxvi. 9, to the uprising of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. The objection to this application of a term which is generally used of enemies, is not a strong one because even his own acts, though the opposite of hostile, are, in the forcible diction which characterises these chapters, designated by hostile terms. See x. 5 (αἰχμ.) xi. and xii. 16. He does not mean actual hostility but a pressure as urgent as that of attacking enemies.

The second is the best of the two views above given, and the grammatical difficulty, which seems to be against it at first sight, is really in its favour, because it is natural and Pauline. It is right to say that some good scholars still maintain the rendering 'without' for παρεκτός and hold the drift to be:—'apart from those things that are without the care of all the churches presses upon me daily,' which is favoured, it appears, by the Coptic. This implies the reading ἐπίστασις upon which see note at end of chapter.

29. Illustration of the onset and the anxiety. Whenever anyone whose conscience, having been fashioned upon the law, has not grown to the true understanding and exercise of Christian freedom, is weak and therefore troubled by the use or abuse of this freedom on the part of others, the Apostle is, by the identification of sympathy, weak with him and feels his weakness as if it were his own (1 Cor. ix. 22). That this is the form of weakness meant is rendered almost certain by what we know of the relation of Jewish and heathen converts in mixed Churches and especially by such a passage as 1 Cor. viii. 7,

Digitized by Google

weak? who is offended, and I burn not?

30 If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things which concern mine infirmities.

31 The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.

32 In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me:

33 And through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands.

---

which furnishes a case exactly in point in connection with meats offered to idols. These weak brethren resorted to him in their perplexities and made an onset upon him for counsel and help. They had clearly appealed to him both about the relations of the sexes and participation in idol-banquets. "**Who is entrapped** (into sin) and **I am not on fire**, (with indignation)?" The original for "is entrapped," is too often rendered by 'is offended,' which does not give the proper sense. The case mentioned in 1 Cor. viii. 7 shows exactly what is meant here. If a man has the knowledge to discern that an idol is nothing and that the fact of meats having been offered to an idol makes no difference with regard to them, he is *strong* and may eat with impunity. If anyone has scruples of conscience about an idol and an impression that meats offered to it have been desecrated and become unholy, he is *weak*. If the example of the strong, who in strength eat such meats leads the *weak* to participate also, although he has a misgiving of conscience, he is decoyed into sin, his conscience is defiled. It is plain from 1 Cor. viii. 13, where the same word 'entrap' occurs, that his indignation was much and often kindled by the reckless conduct of the wise and emancipated at Corinth.

**30.** A retrospective and prospective reflection furnishes the transition-step from what precedes to what follows. To make it wholly prospective because of the future tense is far too rigid and quite unnecessary. That tense in "I will boast of the things pertaining to my weakness" expresses the standing rule by which, whenever circumstances require it, he does and will boast, and which distinguishes his boasting from that of his adversaries. "Weak" in the last verse suggested "weakness" in this. His sympathy with the weak and his indignation are part of his anxious care (v. 28), and imply an unrest of flesh and spirit which is justly termed weakness. But the reference plainly extends to vv. 23–28, his sense of the term weakness being a wide one.

The God and Father of Him who is the Truth and will hereafter be the judge of truth and falsehood, God, who knows all things, knows that he lies not in what he has said and is going to say. "Who is blessed for ever" is a brief pious doxology adding solemnity to the asseveration and perhaps expresses thankfulness for deliverance and support in all these distresses The adjuration points to something forthcoming which might be thought incredible. It does not refer chiefly to the specific incident of vv. 32, 33, because that, although remarkable, must have been known at least to the Judaizers in Corinth, but extends to the supernatural experiences of the next chapter and applies mainly and most appropriately to them, inasmuch as they were very extraordinary, and no one could vouch for them but the Apostle himself. Thus, although there is apparently an abrupt aposiopesis at the end of this chapter, yet the narrative really runs on unbroken.

**32, 33.** "In Damascus the **Ethnarch** (Governor) **of** Aretas the king **was watching** the city of Damascus, to apprehend me, etc., etc." Acts ix. 23–25. There is reason to think that the word '*desirous*' (θέλων) of the A. V. was imported into the text. This event also illustrates the Apostle's weakness because he was driven to extreme straits and his mode of escape was perhaps not without a touch of seeming ignominy. For Aretas, Harethath II., surnamed Aeneas and called the 'friend of the people,' King of Arabia from B.C. 7 to A.D. 40, see Smith's 'Dict. of Bible.' He seems to have wrested Damascus from the Romans and to have entrusted it to an ethnarch or provincial governor. If the statement be true that there were 10,000 Jews in Damascus, it is not surprising that they should have had influence enough to induce the governor to watch the gates of the City (ἐφρούρει) by a military or police force, and this would sufficiently explain what is said in Acts ix. 24, that the *Jews* watched the gates. The window may have been that of some disciple's house, situated like Rahab's on the town-wall, which would account for the disciples (Acts ix. 25) finding safe access in spite of the watch. The name of Damascus, somewhat irregularly repeated here in that of its inhabitants was deeply graven on the Apostle's memory, being inseparably associated with the great turning point of his life, which is the reason why his experience there is mentioned. The drift is:—



Digitized by Google

'there, where my ministry began, began also my weakness; there the persecutor became the persecuted.' This also partly accounts for his specifying only this one deliverance out of many. Similarly in the next chapter he speaks of only one vision and revelation. Each was, in fact, a type of its class. If the vision and revelation were coincident or nearly so, in point of time, with the deliverance there was good ground for adducing them together. If his preaching at Damascus, which immediately preceded the attempt upon his life, was subsequent to his three years' sojourn in Arabia, i.e. about A.D. 43, as this Epistle was written A.D. 57, the deduction of 14 years (xii. 2) would bring the vision and revelation exactly to A.D. 43. His return to Jerusalem also is spoken of in the Acts ix. 25, 26 as if it followed immediately after his departure from Damascus. See Gal. i. 17, and Bp. Lightfoot's note on St. Paul's sojourn in Arabia.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on ver. 28.

28. Besides some support from MSS. and the concurrence of the Greek Fathers, ἐπισύστασις, the reading of the Received Text, has some weighty internal considerations in its favour, which may be seen in Osiand. Hofm. or Klöpper. But it must be allowed that external evidence is almost overwhelming on the side of ἐπίστασις, which is found in Sin. B. D. E. F. G. 17, and is reproduced in the 'instantia' of the Vulgate.

The two words are in competition also in Acts xxiv. 12, and it is asserted that ἐπισύστασις was imported from that passage into the one before us. If ἐπισύστασις is the true reading there, the circumstance is in favour of it here, because it occurs in a speech of St. Paul, which would shew that it was a Pauline word. Some of the editors are most arbitrary. In Acts xxiv. 12 ἐπίστ. is supported by Sin. A.B.E. and several cursives. If Meyer can put aside that strong testimony with a single word 'Schreibfehler' (clerical error) and Alford with the phrase "correction to more simple word," and prefer ἐπίσυστασις there, why do they not determine in the same way here? They admit that their stumbling-block is the *hostile* sense of ἐπισύστασις, which is precisely what would make it the more suitable term. Some editors who read ἐπίστασις seem to find no difficulty as to its meaning, and Meyer is satisfied with a construction out of all harmony with the style from v. 22 onward and with a rendering which has fairly been called a "tautological curiosity." If ἐπίστασις is the true reading it is probable that it should be rendered in a sense approximating that of ἐπισύστασις by some such term as 'onset,' 'pressure on,' and the verb from which it is derived undoubtedly has some similar senses. This is the view of Rückert, who accepts ἐπιστασις as the true reading, as well as of Buttm. (N. T. Gr. p. 156) and Klöpper who reject it. Ἡ ἐπίστασις τῆς κακίας in 2 Macc. vi. 3 with Grimm's interpretation of it may be compared. Meyer's remark that ἐπίστ. there denotes 'setting in' or 'beginning' is very doubtful. Other meanings of the word, some possible and others impossible, which have been tried upon the verse under discussion, all yield a forced or obscure sense.

## CHAPTER XII.

1 *For commending of his apostleship, though he might glory of his wonderful revelations,* 9 *yet he rather chooseth to glory of his infirmities,* 11 *blaming them for forcing him to this vain boasting.* 14 *He promiseth to come to them again: but yet altogether in the affection of a father,* 20 *although he feareth he shall to his grief find many offenders, and publick disorders there.*

IT is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord.

CHAP. XII. 1. "**To boast indeed** is not expedient for me." It is, as before said, folly, and unconducive to his best welfare. The reason why he makes the remark (γάρ) is that he will now adduce those supernatural experiences, which raised him so immeasurably above his adversaries, but which might easily prompt any one to boasting, and which they regarded as vainglorious hallucinations (vi. 13). He intimates that he knows well the folly of boasting about them and accordingly, in speaking of them, he scrupulously shuns every semblance of a boast.

N.B. This interpretation is based upon the Received Text which is here approved by many good expositors. But the reading which has by far the strongest external support yields

Digitized by Google

2 I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven.

---

the following rendering:—'I needs must boast; though (it is) not expedient, yet I will come to visions and revelations,' the drift of which is quite intelligible and suits the context excellently. See note at end of chapter.

The original for visions (ὀπτασίαι) signifies, with only one or two exceptions, *supernatural* sights presented to the spiritual or spiritualised gaze of one sleeping, waking, or in ecstasy. The "visions and revelations of the Lord" does not mean those in which the Lord was the person seen and revealed, although the words admit of that sense (Mat. iii. 2; Luke xxiv. 23), but those of which the Lord is the author and giver. See the undoubted parallels, Gal. ii. 12 and Apoc. i. 1. Where "the revelation of Jesus Christ" is mentioned (1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; iv. 13), it signifies His manifestation at the Parousia, which cannot be the sense here. Visions and revelations thus include not only those cases in which Christ himself was seen and revealed and of which He was also the author, but also others, such as that of Acts xvi. 9. The vision "permits only to see," but the revelation "discloses also something deeper than the thing seen" (Theophyl.). It may reasonably be conjectured that, in the case before us, the vision and revelation concerned, in part at least, St. Paul's return from Arabia to a new sphere of action. For other instances take, above all, his conversion and see Gal. ii. 2, compared with Acts xv. 2 ff.; Acts xvi. 9; xviii. 9; xxii. 17–21. As he received many such disclosures of Christ's will, his teaching, his conduct of his ministry, and his government of the churches were placed beyond question or appeal.

For the reading in the first part of this verse see note at end of chapter.

**2.** One example, "I **know of** a man in Christ, fourteen years ago, whether in the body I know not, or out of the body I know not; God knoweth: (I know) of such a one as this (having been) rapt as far as the third heaven." He shrunk from saying '*I* was rapt,' which would have seemed like a boast. His personal will was for the time so annihilated that he speaks of himself as though he were another and not himself. "A man in Christ" might merely describe his Christian state, but in this context it expresses that his individuality was swallowed up in Christ; that it was the spirit of Christ in which he lived that rendered him capable of the translation and its experiences. "Fourteen years ago" is to be connected with "having been rapt," as are also the phrases "in the body" and "out of the body." The specific date enables *us* to synchronise this rapture approximately with the events at Damascus, but whether it was meant to serve the same purpose for the *first readers* is not clear. It seems to come from the Apostle quite naturally in the vividness of his recollection as marking the great epoch of his life. The undercurrent of his own thought probably was:—'at that town and time, the place and the period of God's mercy towards me, began not my sufferings only but also my super-terrestrial experiences.' The circumstantiality of the exact time shews that he is describing an actual fact, not an imagination. Of the rapture he knows. What he does *not* know is whether the entire man was rapt, body included, or the man without the body. Which of these two things had befallen him was his doubt and not at all "whether he were carried up into heaven literally or only in a figure." His human consciousness, as to this point, was obliterated, and he must also have been alone at the time of rapture, otherwise he could have solved his doubt by enquiry of others. All interpretations which exclude from his thoughts the notion of a possible *bodily* translation are against the plain drift of his language. Translation in the body was an idea familiar to Jewish theology and Irenaeus thought that Enoch and Elijah had been admitted into Paradise in the body. "Such a one as this" means a man in Christ, so long ago, unconscious whether in the body or disembodied. The original for "rapt" (ἁρπάζειν) denotes more than once miraculous seizure and transportation, not always into heaven but sometimes from one earthly place to another, the agent being the Holy Spirit. Ez. iii. 14, where the word however is ἐξῆρε. 1 Kin. xviii. 12; Acts viii. 39, 40. "As far as the third heaven." The interpretations of these words which deny their numerical and local sense, taking the number three only as significant of what is excellent and perfect, may be discarded. Nothing could indicate number and space more pointedly than "as far as." But it is impossible to determine precisely St. Paul's conception of the heavens. He mentions here three heavens with Paradise in v. 4, and the passage into Paradise is assuredly a further stage of the translation. Paradise can only be identified with the third heaven on the supposition that "as far as" means 'to the *confines* of.' Yet it seems to be universally assumed that the first stage of the translation was *into* the third heaven. Scripture nowhere gives an enu-



Digitized by Google

3 And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;)

4 How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not [1]lawful for a man to utter.

[1] Or, *possible.*

5 Of such an one will I glory: yet of myself I will not glory, but in mine infirmities.

6 For though I would desire to glory, I shall not be a fool; for I will say the truth: but *now* I forbear, lest any man should think

---

meration or a scale of the heavens, but a plurality of them is recognised both in the O. and the N. T. Christ is said in Eph. iv. 10 to have "ascended high-above *all* the heavens," where "all" has a prominent position, and in iv. 14 to have "passed *through* the heavens," from which it might be inferred that "the Paradise of God" (Rev. ii. 7), where Christ dwells is an altogether supercelestial sphere, yet he is said in Heb. ix. 24 to have entered "into heaven itself," which may mean "the *very* heaven" and elsewhere, as in Luke xxiv. 51, Acts i. 11, "into the heaven." But the heaven which God and Christ inhabit is itself represented as complex, as in the Lord's Prayer: "Our Father which art in the heavens," while we have in the same prayer "thy will be done as in heaven so on earth" (Matt. vi. 10), where, however, "heaven" does not necessarily denote God's immediate or personal habitation. St. Paul, no doubt, had a definite conception, but he has not declared it distinctly. The majority of expositors think that he recognises three heavens, of which the third is Paradise.

**3.** The copulative "and" itself shews that what he here knows is something more than what he stated in v. 2, and therefore that his admission into Paradise was a continuation of his translation. If it were not so, this verse would be pure tautology. "Such a one as this" therefore now implies, in addition to its meaning in v. 2, 'a man rapt as far as the third heaven.' At the gates of Paradise, before access to the divine presence, he seems to pause with reverential awe, and restates his unconsciousness as to his embodied or disembodied state in the same language as before, substituting only "apart from" for "out of." The repetition may imply that he conceived the possibility of his body having been left in the vestibule of Paradise, so to speak, and that his spirit and soul alone were admitted.

**4.** For 'Paradise' see note on Luke xxiii. 43. He does not say what he saw but only what he heard; but, as he is giving an account of a *vision*, and also speaking with reverential reticence, we are justified in inferring that he saw the things incorruptible, undefiled, which fade not away, reserved in heaven for the Saints (1 Pet. i. 4), and that he beheld the glorified Lord. He heard "**unutterable utterances**," which seems the only way of reproducing the play upon words of the original. "Unutterable" means what the divine will does not allow to be uttered, as is explained by the words that follow:—"which is not **permitted** for a man to speak," the original for "permitted" denoting authorization. The word for "speak" is that used in xi. 17, 23, and may involve a suggestion of the profanity there would be in making the contents of the revelation matter of ordinary communication, and this is, no doubt, part of the force of the word "man," for a human being may not treat divine disclosures as he will.

**5.** The application of the facts, just narrated, to the boasting which is the question in hand. "On behalf of such a one as this I will boast," if need be, "but on behalf of myself I will not boast." "Such a one as this" has again accumulated its meaning, and signifies now, in addition to what it implied before, one who "heard unutterable utterances." On behalf of one, who in all this was entirely passive and recipient, without exertion or merit of his own, he will boast, but not on behalf of his personal self, his own will, work and service, except with regard to his infirmities. He has already in mind the infirmity of v. 7, the correlative of his visions and revelations.

**6.** The reason why he will thus limit his boasting, although he need not do it. "For if I should be disposed to boast, I shall not be a fool, for I will speak the truth." Should he please to go beyond merely passive and receptive experience, and adduce something, connected with his visions and revelations and referring to himself, which he *was* at liberty to communicate and which did admit of being put forth as a ground of boasting, still he would not be guilty of that vaunting folly which violates truth, for there really was something of that kind. "But I forbear, lest any one should **take account** with reference to me beyond what he sees me (to be) or hears aught from me." Whatever estimate his person or speech, as known to his readers, might occasion, he was content with it and would not try to raise it by anything to which their eyes and ears could not bear testimony. He knew in fact that all personal

Digitized by Google

of me above that which he seeth me *to be*, or *that* he heareth of me.

7 And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me [b]a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.

8 For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me.

[b] See Ezek. 28. 24.

---

defects were in accordance with God's will and served His purpose, as he goes on to shew.

N. B. It is doubtful whether 'aught' should stand in the text.

7. "And" he has good reason for abstaining. "In order that I should not be over-exalted with **the excess** of the revelations" and so inclined to make them matters of self-glorification "there was given to me" (by God) **a stake for the flesh, an angel** of Satan to buffet me, that I should not be over-exalted." The simple copulative "and," which plainly joins "was given" with "I forbear," shews that the boasting from which he abstains refers to something closely associated with his visions and revelations, if it was not an actual part of these, immediately concerning himself personally. "The excess of the revelations" means that they transcended all ordinary limits either in measure or in character or both. It is still contended by some good expositors that the original for "stake" here means 'thorn,' chiefly on the ground that "stake" yields an exaggerated figure, the answer to which is that the affliction, being altogether extraordinary, required to be forcibly expressed. Certainly a stake was an instrument of pain because of its pointed end; "thorns (ἄκανθαι) and stakes (σκόλοπες) signify pains because of their sharpness," Artemidorus. The right translation, however, is not a 'stake *in* the flesh,' which *would* yield an overstrained idea, but a stake *for* the flesh. Now the stake was used for the dreadful punishment of impaling and a derivative of the word for stake (ἀνασκολοπίζειν) signifies (Herod. ix. 78) a form of execution not essentially different from crucifixon. The Greek for a cross (σταυρός) denotes an upright stake (crux simplex) and σκόλοψ only differs from it in having a sharp end, which a σταυρός also might have. If the Apostle merely meant a thorn, he might have used the more exact word ἀκάνθη. The mortification or crucifixion of the flesh is a familiar idea with him (Rom. vi. 6; viii. 13), and it seems almost certain that this was in his mind. The flesh signifies here the sinful principle from which the tendency to self-exaltation arises and which, as it is seated in the body (Rom. vi. 6; vii. 23; viii. 13; 1 Cor. ix. 27), is capable of subjugation and destruction by bodily suffering. The giver of the stake cannot be Satan, who is but the secondary agent, subservient to an over-ruling God (Job i. 11, 12), and whose object it could not have been to prevent over-exaltation, but only to torment and cripple and, if possible, to ruin. The stake is further described as "an angel of Satan," and the seeming incongruity of so designating a stake may perhaps be accounted for by his sense of the suffering attached to it, which is so strong that he cannot regard niceties of style, but identifies the instrument of torture with Satan's subordinate who bears it. St. Paul recognises here and elsewhere Satan's derived power of inflicting bodily suffering and disease (1 Cor. v. 5). Satan's immediate purpose was to "buffet" his victim or 'smite him with the fist' (κολαφίζῃ). These words go closely with "angel," which contains etymologically the idea of a person *sent*. They express violence, like that of a stunning blow, and indignity. The buffeting may denote the first assault, the maltreatment preliminary to the more deadly application of the stake. The tense of the original implies that the buffeting was a continued one, not indeed without interruption, but inflicted from time to time. The impression given by the passage is that the buffetings and sufferings were closely connected in time with the visions and revelations. The words which repeat the divine purpose at the end of the verse are omitted in many good MSS, but this may be accounted for by the copyists not appreciating the repetition and thinking that the same thing would not be said twice or supposing, when their eyes fell upon the words, that they were those which they had just written. The reiteration was prompted by the importance of God's purpose to the Apostle's argument, and the great consolation it involved.

The sense might be 'concerning this' angel of Satan, but the reference probably is to the whole statement of v. 7, and in that case, Luther's rendering "for this" is the right one, the drift being 'for its removal.' Knowing the divine purpose St. Paul must have felt the pain and humiliation of the stake very deeply before he prayed for deliverance. One is irresistibly reminded of Gethsemane. He prayed three times and no more, not on account of any religious significance of the number nor even after his Master's example, but for the plain reason that after

Digitized by Google

9 And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

10 Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessi-

---

the third petition he received his answer. The word for "besought" (παρεκάλεσα) is never used in scripture for prayer to God, and Socinians have picked out of it an argument against Christ's divinity, as signifying not invocatio but advocatio, as if one who is 'advocatus' may not be 'invocatus' also. Even St. John applies a derivative of the same word, Paraclete, advocatus, to the Saviour, 1 Jno. ii. 1, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father." Παρακαλεῖν was precisely the right word here, for Paul, now the sufferer, calls to his side or aid Christ, once the sufferer, that He may remove that distressing affliction, which the servant thought, in his human view, an impediment to his Master's cause.

On the stake for the flesh, see note at end of chapter.

**9.** The Lord's reply. "He **has said** to me." The perfect tense denotes that what the Lord said was a *standing* answer valid for the Apostle's whole life. It has the solemnity of the formula so often used by the Prophets:—'Thus saith the Lord,' or 'The Lord hath said,' and approaches the force of 'It is written.' The context is entirely against the notion that this answer was a 'testimonium Sancti Spiritus internum.' It was a special communication belonging to the same class with the revelations of which he has been speaking and a part of one of them. "Sufficient for thee is my grace." The prayer was not granted any more than the Saviour's in the garden but a surpassing compensation was made. The close relation in which the words place the Apostle and the Saviour was itself unspeakable comfort. Christ's gracious favour exercised in bestowing gifts upon men according to their need sufficed for maintaining His servant's energy for his work and the great law upon which such sufficiency is based is: "my power is perfected in weakness." The logical conclusion (οὖν) is a delightful revolution in his feelings and views about weaknesses. "Most gladly therefore will I rather" (than desire the removal of them, v. 8) "boast in my weaknesses." The position of "rather" in the original shews that it cannot mean 'rather than in anything else' or 'rather than in revelations' and the idea above given is strictly in accordance with the context. The boasting, of course, implies a real inward joy like that of Acts iv. 41, but still must be taken in the full sense in which it is one of the key-notes to the whole passage, as *uttered* glorying. The object of it is that he may obtain the promise of grace and power implied in Christ's answer:—"in order that **there may tabernacle** upon me the power of Christ." The figure has not the same purport as in Ps. xxvi. 5, "in the secret place of His tabernacle shall He hide me," where it signifies outward protection more than inward strength. Nor is the idea that of Christ's power descending to over-canopy him as with the awning of a tent. But the Apostle is the person upon whom the power comes and itself makes tabernacle. In-dwelling is not expressed in the words, but follows from on-dwelling, by reason of the nature of the case. The Holy Spirit, the agent of Christ's power, subsisting and operating within, is often represented as being over or coming upon the subjects *in* whom it works. "The Holy Spirit shall come *upon* thee and the power of the most High shall *over-shadow* thee" (Luke i. 35). The Spirit *descended upon* our Lord at His Baptism (Luke iii. 22) and '*abode upon* Him' (Jno. i. 32), and immediately afterwards we hear that he was *full of* the Holy Spirit" (Luke iv. 1). The two ideas are brought together in Acts i. 8. "Ye shall *receive power*, when the Holy Spirit has *come upon* you;" and again, ii. 3, 4, "it settled *upon* them and they were all *filled with* the Holy Ghost." The very term for 'to tabernacle' in the original, occurs in profane Greek with precisely the same construction (ἐπί with acc.) to denote soldiers taking up quarters *in* houses, exactly as we speak of being quartered or billeted *upon* houses, Polyb. Hist. IV. xviii. 8; cf. IV. xlii. 1. There is probably an allusion to the Tabernacle and the Shechinah. In Exodus xl. 34, 35, the luminous cloud abode *upon* the tent of the congregation and the glory of the Lord *filled* the tabernacle, which closely foreshadows the settling of the Pentecostal fire upon the disciples and their being filled with the Holy Ghost. The on-dwelling and in-dwelling of the Shechinah is confessedly the type of God's presence amongst and in his people in the higher sense of the New Dispensation and the representation of the Church as a whole and of its members individually as Temples of God occurs several times in the two Epistles to the Corinthians.

**10.** A final inference from the relation of his weakness to Christ's strength and going beyond that of the last verse, by passing from a *feeling* of elation in weaknesses to a calm

Digitized by Google

ties, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.

11 I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing.

12 Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

13 For what is it wherein ye were

---

approval of them by the mind and judgment (εὐδοκῶ. v. 8), and by specifying various extreme forms of them with a sense of triumph that, in all, the strength of grace conquers the feebleness of the flesh. He then worthily winds up his boasting by a noble Christian paradox, which identifies the times of his weakness precisely with those of his strength.

**11.** On a retrospect, however, he finds that he has actually shewn himself in that character, which he would have no one ascribe to him (xi. 16), but in which nevertheless his readers must accept him. The extenuating circumstance, exculpating him and inculpating them, is compulsion. He has not been a free agent. "**It was ye that compelled** me." The reason of the necessity laid upon him is:—"*I*," not others, "ought to have been commended by you." They not only failed in their obligation to make his boasting needless by their own commendation of him but they set his opponents above him and commended them. The emphasis upon *I* cannot well express according to the context any other antithesis except that between the Apostle and his adversaries as objects of commendation. The ground of their obligation to commend him:—"For in nothing **did I fall short of the superlative** Apostles, nothing though I am." The difference between this statement and that of xi. 5, is that there he asserted a general and standing non-inferiority, whereas he here asserts a non-inferiority proved in his actual ministry among them (aor.). Hence the clause is a transition-link to the appeal to facts (12 ff.) with which they were acquainted. In himself he was nothing, only by the grace of Christ had he been, what he had been in Corinth (1 Cor. xv. 9, 10).

**12.** Proof of his equality. "The signs **indeed** of an Apostle were **fully wrought** among you in all **patient endurance** by signs and wonders and powers." *In* signs (A. V.) is based on a very doubtful reading. The original is 'of *the* Apostle,' the article marking that an individual is taken as the representative of his class (xi. 4). The "**indeed**" implies something antithetical, which however the reader has to supply for himself. The proofs "indeed" of Apostleship were furnished, but their right *effect* did not follow. The full force of the expressed and the suppressed ideas might perhaps be rendered by 'at any rate' or 'at least.' 'The signs of an Apostle' are miracles as credentials of genuine Apostleship. St. Paul was placed on a level with the original Twelve by possession of the superhuman powers with which Christ had formally endowed them all (Luke ix. 1, 2). The miracle was a true and essential sign of an Apostle, and the fact that his adversaries had no power of miracles was probably the point of inferiority which galled them most and it was impossible to leave it unmentioned. If they wrought miracles, it could only have been by Satanic help, but if they had put forward any pretensions to supernatural agency, there would probably have been some allusion to it. The passive form "were wrought" was used purposely to exclude all idea of the Apostle having wrought them by his own power, Acts iii. 12, 16; Rom. xv. 18. The original (κατειργάσθη) is a strong term meaning more than merely were 'realised' and, if not so much as 'perficere rem arduam factuque difficilem,' yet expressing the *complete* and *unmistakable* performance of miracles in the sense in which St. John calls them continually by a cognate term "works." The frame of mind in which his miracles had been wrought was "all patient endurance." It can easily be imagined how often he may have been tempted in his difficulties at Corinth to resort to the miracle in order to confirm the doctrine of Christ crucified (1 Cor. i. 23) by a sign following (Mark xvi. 20), or to inflict a well-merited punishment (Acts xiii. 11), or to establish his Apostolic claims, or attest his strength when taunted with weakness. Accordingly he had wrought miracles many and various, as the accumulated designations of them here intimate, but he had exercised a long-suffering endurance which did not fail him in any circumstances, (πάσῃ) having been patient under opposition and calumny and in tolerating error and weakness. He had been forbearing in his recourse to miracles and had left, as much as possible, his Gospel and himself to the best of all human attestations, the inward approval of conscience. See iv. 2, and v. 11. For the combination of the three terms signs, wonders, and powers compare Acts ii. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Heb. ii. 4.

**13.** Newly-founded Churches naturally regarded miracles as a glory and a blessing,

Digitized by Google

inferior to other churches, except *it be* that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong.

14 Behold, the third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be burdensome to you: for I seek not your's, but you: for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children.

15 And I will very gladly spend

---

and the reasoning of this verse is: You had this distinction and benefit, '*for* (γάρ) there is nothing in which you were **made to fall short** beyond the rest of the Churches.' But instead of saying categorically 'there is nothing in which,' he says with animation 'what is there in which?" He does not imply either ironically or really that the churches founded by him were at a disadvantage as compared with those founded by others. But he had treated the Corinthians with even greater favour than the rest of his own churches (see xi. 8), as a single exception, which he specifies with sarcastic reproach, proves. He *reverts* to his gratuitous preaching of the Gospel, upon which he had already dwelt in xi. 7–12, because he has not yet said his last word about it. He has still a slander to repel and a claim to make for his colleagues (*vv.* 17, 18), whom he was on the point of sending to them a second time. The subject led him on in the last chapter to the contrast between himself and his adversaries, and it now leads him on to the likeness between himself and his companions. The words "I myself" perhaps distinguish his person from his office, in which case the drift would be: 'I who did the work and exhibited the signs of an Apostle, and therefore had a right to maintenance, did not *personally* become a burden to you;' or himself from his adversaries, in which case the force is: 'I who had most right to support, was the *very* person who did not do what others with no claim did.' His prayer to be pardoned for this as an injury is a cutting version of what he said without irony in xi. 8.

**14.** The pardon is to be prospective as well as retrospective, because he purposes on his forthcoming visit to use the same abstinence as he had done on his two previous visits. It was well to state this beforehand, because after the establishment of reconciliation he might be pressed with offers of alimony, which however it would have damaged his cause to accept, and this announcement would make it easier to decline. The first words of the verse might, as far as language goes, express only a third *readiness* to come, although it would be rather illogical to represent a readiness to come as a third term to one actual coming and a second *readiness to come*. But the context is decisive in favour of two antecedent actual visits, because it would be absurd to allude to a disinterestedness which he *only would have observed had he come* when he was ready to do so a second time, as a reason why he should maintain his consistency upon this point. The reason why the words "a third time" are not placed in juxtaposition with 'to come,' is that they stand first for the sake of emphasis. In order to strip his resolve to persist in taking nothing of all appearance of unkindness, he assigns as his motive the very opposite of that suggested in xi. 11. "For I do not seek what is your's, but you." The motto of the whole Epistle might have been "my son, give me thine heart." He bases this motive affectionately and almost playfully upon the duty which parents owe to children: "For there is no obligation upon children to store up treasure for parents, but upon parents for children." The links of connection are subtle and beautiful. By taking their unrighteous mammon he might lose *them*, but if by desiring *them* he should win them, he would win them not for himself, but for Christ, and they would receive from Christ through his hands the true riches. He would thus fulfil his paternal obligation to lay up treasures for them (vi. 19).

**15.** But he is ready to go far beyond the requirements of this natural law. "**But I** will most gladly spend and be spent **to the uttermost for your souls.**" He will not only lay up riches for them, but will give as purchase-money in order to gain and save their souls, all that he has, will spare no labour, self-denial, suffering; nay, will be lavish of himself to the complete wearing out of his earthen-vessel, that they may receive of the treasure which it contains. Cf. Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 23–27; Phil. ii. 17. He cannot forbear appending to this avowal of ever-increasing and superabounding love, a reproachful reminder of the niggard and, until recently, ever-diminishing requital of it by his readers. "Though, for loving you the more superabundantly, I am the less loved."

N.B. The reading of the original is not the usual Greek for 'though,' but means simply 'if,' which rendering some approve, making the drift of the verse to be: 'if the requital of love is in inverse ratio to the love, I will try to rectify the disproportion by boundless self-devotion;' heaping coals of fire on their head. But this would scarcely harmonise with the "most gladly," and a

Digitized by Google

[1] Gr. *your souls.*

and be spent for [1]you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved.

16 But be it so, I did not burden you: nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile.

17 Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you?

18 I desired Titus, and with *him* I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? walked we not in the same spirit? *walked we* not in the same steps?

19 Again, think ye that we excuse ourselves unto you? we speak before God in Christ: but *we do* all things, dearly beloved, for your edifying.

20 For I fear, lest, when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and *that* I shall be found unto you such

---

view better entitled to consideration, is that the Apostle is assigning, in affectionate *irony*, the reason of his self-devotion, in which case the perfectly admissible rendering 'since,' must be adopted (Herod. vii. 46). But εἰ admits also of being idiomatically translated by 'though,' according to a use of it called by some grammarians 'concessive.' 'If' is used similarly in our own language: 'If you are learned, do not be arrogant.' If ἀγαπῶ, not ἀγαπῶν, were the true reading and the clause were taken interrogatively it would yield a good and simple sense. 'If I love you more superabundantly, am I the less loved?' Is that reasonable?

**16.** He had been charged with declining support himself for the dishonest purpose of obtaining it more largely through his agents, and the imputation was connected with his endeavours to expedite the collection through Titus and others. For the sake of argument he allows the charge in order to see how it tallies with facts. "But be it so; I did not **become a burden** to you; **yet** (per contra), being a **crafty villain**, I caught you by guile." The original for "crafty villain" means strictly one who chooses with shrewd discernment the aptest means for attaining unprincipled ends (Arist. Eth. Nic. VI. xii. 9). For the rendering "caught" see xi. 20.

**17.** How stand the facts? "**Any one of those I despatched to you**—did I, through him, **over-reach** you?" The original asks feelingly a question which demands a negative answer, its real force being:—'do not say that I did.'

**18.** Appeal to examples. The mission of Titus is not that alluded to in viii. 17, upon which he had not yet been actually despatched, but that on which he had "previously initiated" (viii. 6) the making up of the collection. Who the "brother" was, is not certain, but he was probably the person so strongly recommended under the same designation in viii. 22, and now on the point of accompanying Titus again in the same capacity. "Was it not **by** the same spirit that we walked?" expresses the inward law which regulated their conduct, and which was the guidance of the Holy Spirit, excluding every covetous and interested motive. "Was it not in the same footsteps?" passes from the directing principle in the heart to the outward walk, of which those who witnessed it could very well judge. The Apostle speaks quite confidently of the incontrovertibleness of these proofs, and it would appear therefore that Titus had taken no part of the collection into his own keeping, much less conveyed anything to St. Paul. He probably prevailed upon the Corinthians to comply with the counsel given them in 1 Cor. xvi. 2, and perhaps to establish a general fund.

**19.** The apology and boasting, now completed, have to be guarded from a misapprehension. It was easy for his readers to glide into the tribunal and imagine that theirs was the judgment-seat from which sentence had to be delivered. "**Ye are this long time** (πάλαι with many MSS. not πάλιν) **thinking** that it is to you we are making our defence." Not so. "It is before God, in Christ, that we speak." It would have been impossible, under any circumstances, for an Apostle to place himself before a human bar (1 Cor. ii. 15; iv. 3) for judgment, but it was peculiarly necessary to repudiate the jurisdiction of that section of his readers which he is now addressing, because they had shewn a bias in favour of his accusers. He takes the sting out of his repudiation, however, by his closing words:—"**but the whole**, beloved, (is) for your edification." So far as his authority in Corinth was undermined, so far were they tottering and it was necessary to reconsolidate *his* position in order that *theirs* might be restored and secured.

**20.** He has reason to labour for their edification, for he entertains the twofold fear that he may find them, when he comes, not such as he wishes, and may himself therefore "be found for them not such as they wish." His fear about them again takes a double direction, one towards the Judaizers on the

Digitized by Google

as ye would not: lest *there be* debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults:

21 *And* lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and *that* I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed.

---

right (v. 20), the other towards the heathenizers on the left (v. 21). Both parties wished to see him as they thought they had seen him on his second visit, weak and without energy. Instead of that and instead of being a fellow-worker of their joy, he apprehends that he may have to wield a severe rod of discipline. The first class of dreaded evils are those party-divisions which he had to rebuke and threaten in the First Epistle (i. 10–13; iii. 3–5; iv. 21). The list is:—strifes, jealousy, outbursts of anger, intrigues, calumnies open and secret, inflated airs of superiority, and finally, the disastrous result of all these to the Church, "disturbances" which destroy its established organization. It appears from this dark calendar that, although the chief developments since the First Epistle had been those of Judaism and of heathenism, and the main struggle was between these two great streams, against both of which St. Paul and his adherents had to contend, yet other currents of rivalry had not ceased to be active. Partizanship was in fact an habitual part of the mental and moral life of a society like that of Corinth.

**21.** His fear with regard to those who lived in pagan immorality is: "lest **again, when I come** God shall humble me **before** you, and I shall **have to mourn for many of those who were sinners before and did not repent over** the uncleanness and fornication and licentiousness which they **practised.**" It is plain that the "again" goes with the "humble" and not with the "come," because, if it belonged to the latter, it would have absolutely no meaning, and it would have been quite sufficient to say 'when I come.' As it is, it emphasises, by standing first, a second humiliation and implies that the Apostle had already suffered one, viz., on his second visit. It has already been seen (Introd. p. 378), that the first humiliation was caused by the moral evils which he had gone to check, but found it expedient or possible only to rebuke, not to punish. The persons rebuked are the same that he now mentions. They were in a state of sin before his second visit and did not come to repentance, when he was there, although threatened. To find them persisting and setting his word at nought (x. 10) would be humbling enough, but the scorn of the Judaizers for not applying sharp discipline, which was a part of his previous humiliation, he did not intend to incur again, but still he dreads a pain of another kind. He had, no doubt, learned from Titus, that "many" of the immoral persons were none the better for his warnings and over these he fears that he will have to *mourn*. This cannot mean a mourning of mere pity and sorrow, as if these men were carried away by the infirmities of nature. The original term properly denotes mourning for the dead, and here signifies grief for those who will suffer the chastisement which he declares (xiii. 2) that he will inflict. As they belonged to the same class with the notable offender of 1 Cor. v., it may be inferred that he contemplates passing the same sentence of excommunication upon them that he did upon him, and so would have to sorrow over them as severed and, for a while at least, *dead* members of the visible Church. This view is pointedly corroborated by the language of 1 Cor. v. 2. "Ye are puffed up and did not rather *mourn*, that he who did this deed should be *removed* from the midst of you;" and again, by 1 Cor. v. 7, "*purge* out the old leaven," with reference to the same subject. See also v. 13. The obscurity which has overhung this verse has arisen mainly from the fact of expositors not accepting the simple meaning of an aorist, and therefore rendering, 'who shall not have repented,' i.e. 'when I come again,' instead of "who did not come to repentance," i.e. when I was last at Corinth. It is thus obvious why he anticipates having to mourn only over *many* of those that did not repent, and not over all, for *some* had clearly repented since he was there (ch. vii.). There is a very perceptible ring of forestalled grief in the three terrible words towards the close of the verse.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 1, 7.

**1.** Much, undoubtedly, admits of being said on behalf of the Received Reading, which is retained by Beng. Wettst. Tisch. Osiand. De Wette, Hofm. Klöpper. Reiche's elaborate defence of it (Com. Crit. tom. i. 390–345), though obviously incorrect in several points, may yet be consulted with advantage. But neither it nor Klöpper's strong protest

Digitized by Google

is sufficient to overthrow the external evidence in favour of καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μέν, ἐλεύσομαι δέ, which is as follows: For δεῖ B.D*.E.F.G. 17. 37. Vulg. Syrr. Goth. Arm. For συμφέρον μέν, Sin. B.F.G. 17. Pesch. Memph. Goth. Arm. For δέ instead of γάρ after ἐλεύσομαι, Sin. B.F.G. 17. Vulg. Memph. Arm. Against such an array of authorities Meyer's observation, that μέν—δέ is an obvious importation made to displace the difficult γάρ and that συμφέρον for συμφέρει falls with μέν—δέ, will not stand. Meyer does not succeed in eliciting from his reading an interpretation either consistent with Greek usage or with the context.

### St. Paul's Stake for the Flesh.

7. Of the passages adduced as bearing upon this subject, the most important and perhaps the only two in which the reference to it is unquestionable are:—2 Cor. xii. 7; and Gal. iv. 13, 14. The others are 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. 1, 8; x. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 18. On 2 Cor. x. 10, see Introduction and the notes. The right reading and rendering of Gal. iv. 13, 14 is:—"But ye know that by reason of an infirmity of my flesh I preached the gospel to you on the former visit; and your temptation in my flesh ye did not utterly despise (set at nought) nor loathe." The drift of the first of these clauses is that on the former of two visits, he had not purposed preaching in Galatia, but did so because he was detained there by his peculiar affliction. The drift of the second clause which is rather irregularly expressed, is that the Galatians did not scorn his infirmity nor regard it with abhorrence, although it constituted a temptation to them to repudiate the Gospel, when preached by one so afflicted. This passage and 2 Cor. xii. 7 taken together point to the following results.

1. The affliction was bodily. The proof of this is not the expression "stake for the flesh," which only describes figuratively a means for the mortification, whether conceived as impaling or crucifixion, of the carnal principle of pride which over-exalts a man. The decisive phrase is "*in* my flesh," which shows that the seat of the affliction was the material substance of the body. This is confirmed by the language which follows, for the effect of shocking and revolting those who witnessed it, which is pointed to in the word 'loathe,' could only be produced by visible symptoms. "Infirmity of my flesh" also suggests most naturally, although not necessarily, that the infirmity attached to the body. From its tendency to bring him into contempt the Apostle looked upon it as a grievous impediment to his ministry. The words "smite with the fist" (2 Cor. xii. 7) indicate the violence and the suddenness of its approaches and his detention in Galatia, where he had not meant to stay, shews that he could not forecast its coming on and apparently also that its after-effects were of some duration. The current impression that it was attended by agonising pain is not positively justified by anything that is stated. It probably arose, in part, from a misunderstanding of "stake for the flesh," in part from a notion that only bodily *pain* could mortify spiritual pride, whereas a liability to bodily *humiliation* would do this even more effectually: and, in part, from the expression "an angel of Satan to smite me with the fist," taken in conjunction with the undoubtedly scriptural view that to inflict torture upon men is Satan's congenial occupation.

2. It was an adjunct of his visions and special revelations in two ways, inasmuch as it served a disciplinary purpose in connection with them, and because its particular visits were the immediately antecedent if not the conditional accompaniments of the visions and revelations themselves. This last relation is not only indicated by the Apostle's general statement but appears more distinctly from the fact that the answer "my grace is sufficient for thee" is exactly one of the special revelations in question, and it is reasonable to suppose that it was given in direct reply to the third prayer for deliverance, uttered at a moment when he was painfully sensible of the pressure of his bodily trial. It is to be borne in mind that he is speaking in 2 Cor. xii. of visions and revelations experienced by him while in an *ecstatic* condition, *i.e.*, when the connection between the inner spiritual man and the body was either in complete abeyance or actually for a while severed, and this strongly commends the supposition that the abnormal state of body was a transition-stage to the ecstasy. The three petitions would, in this case, be made, when the Apostle, under some painfully humbling physical conditions, felt his conscious union with his material organism dissolving and the Lord's answer to the third petition would be heard by him when one of the ecstatic states had set in. See Klöpper's remarks on this point. The ecstasy, the visions and revelations, and the peculiar affection of the body, would thus be coincident in time, possibly of the same duration, and, in a certain sense, the complements of each other.

Considerable light is thrown upon the subject by the incidents of the conversion, of which the Apostle's own account, given in Acts xxvi. 11–18 is important, because it proves incontestably that his *very first vision and revelation of the Lord* was accompanied by bodily effects of an altogether unusual and

Digitized by Google

overpowering kind. First the divine radiance shone round about him suddenly like lightning (Acts xxii. 6 ἐξαίφνης περιαστράψαι), and he fell to the ground stricken blind, at which moment it may be safely assumed that he lost all consciousness of earthly things. Whilst he lay, he had a vision of the glorified Saviour, for he said:—"Who art thou, Lord?" Then ensued an express revelation, of which St. Luke, in Acts ix. 4-6, gives only an imperfect report, because the Apostle himself says that the Lord declared to him, in or, to speak strictly, immediately after (εἶδες) "*the heavenly vision*," that he had appeared to him in order to make him "*a minister and a witness of the things which he saw.*" The vision and the revelation therefore must have been very extensive in their scope. When he "was raised" from the ground (Acts ix. 8), "though his eyes were open," he could not see and those who were with him led him by the hand into Damascus. There he remained three days in abstinence from meat and drink and during that time he had a *vision* of Ananias (Acts ix. 12). When he recovered his sight, there fell from his eyes as it were scales. After such a convulsion of his entire nature and long want of sustenance he was in a state of weakness and prostration (Acts ix. 19). The Lord also intimated to him in this his first vision and revelation that further like experiences were in store for him (Acts xxvi. 16 ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι), and if it could be inferred with any certainty that they were attended by similar physical accompaniments, the stake for the flesh might be the liability to a recurrence or the actual recurrence of the bodily state just described, which however is not probable. But, in any case, his conversion furnishes a most striking illustration of the manner in which he may have received his supernatural communications at the precise time when he was under the actual application of the stake for the flesh. Its close conjunction with the visions and revelations does not justify the conclusion that the suffering which it brought and the divine communications *alternated with one another during the ecstasy*, so that the ecstatic, like the waking life of the Apostle was a copy of the life of his Master in its contrary aspects of humiliation and suffering and of exaltation and glory (Klöpper). If the stake for the flesh was felt *during* the ecstasy, he could not have said that he did not know whether he was in the body or out of the body, for a sense of bodily suffering must imply the presence of the body. Some good expositors fail to make it clear, whether they regard the Apostle's ecstatic experiences as the reflex of his waking thoughts and sensations, or as objective realities quite independent of his own mind and feelings. But there is not the shadow of a doubt that St. Paul himself thought what he heard and saw and suffered to be actual facts. Some valuable matter on ecstasy may be seen in Delitzsch's Bibl. Psych. ch. v. See pp. 417-433 E.T., closely bearing on St. Paul's case. One clear result of the intimate union of the stake with the visions and revelations is that the occasions of his suffering from it cannot be regarded and spoken of as if they came on like the attacks of a malady. They coincided with the times at which he stood in need of special disclosures of the divine will and, as has been already observed, the date "fourteen years ago" points to directions given him previously to quitting Arabia for a new province of ministerial work.

3. It is necessary to insist that, when St. Paul ascribes to the stake a twofold relation to the invisible world and sees in it a concurrence of divine and of Satanic agency, the latter controlled by the former, he is neither speaking figuratively nor merely stating his own personal impressions in accordance with popular views, but affirming what he *knew* to be a truth, and his statement is amply supported by other representations in Scripture. The words of Delitzsch are correct and applicable:—"The power of wrath of this (the Satanic) kingdom over men only reaches so far as God permits it; and this permission is measured by his Holy will and grace, which make all created powers, whether of wrath or of love, minister to himself."

This admixture of Satanic action makes the attempt precarious to identify the stake with any known malady or ailment, such as acute headache, earache, a complaint in the eyes, or epilepsy. The view which chiefly claims consideration under this head, although there is an ancient and sustained tradition in favour of headache, is that it was epilepsy. Both Jews and pagans deemed epilepsy a supernatural visitation, and hence its name *morbus divinus*, or *sacer*. Another designation of it, *morbus comitialis*, rested upon the same idea, for if anyone was seized with it in the Roman Forum during an election it was supposed to be the intervention of a god and business was suspended. The original for 'loathe,' in Gal. iv. 14, means literally to "spit out;" and it it curious that epilepsy was also called "*morbus qui sputatur*," beeause those present were "accustomed to spit upon the epileptic or into their own bosoms, either to *express their abomination* or to avert the evil omen for themselves." Persons may become subject to epilepsy at middle age by a great shock, physical or moral or both, such as St. Paul's conversion was. Almost all medical writers on epilepsy mention a patient who before a

Digitized by Google

seizure imagined that he saw a figure approach and smite him *a blow on the head*, after which he lost consciousness. This has a resemblance to the expression "smite with the fist," which might well represent the suddenness of epileptic attacks. Those who happen to have seen a person seized with epilepsy while officiating in divine service will comprehend the language of Gal. iv. 14 and how natural it would be for St. Paul to regard any bodily liability at all resembling it as a terrible hindrance to his ministry. After epileptic convulsions have ended there often ensues an insensibility and patients sometimes fall into a profound stupor or coma, which has been known to last as long as a week. This symptom would harmonise with the Apostle's forced stay in Galatia. Still it is doubtful whether any of these points are more than superficial agreements. An epileptic remembers nothing of what passed during the fit, whereas St. Paul had the most vivid recollection of everything. Epilepsy, frequently suffered, generally impairs the intellect, and the cases of Julius Cæsar, Mahomet and Buonaparte, who are quoted as instances of high intellectual power remaining in spite of epilepsy, are not deemed by medical authorities to be of much value.

An attempt has been made to find an analogy of nature for the Apostle's cross from a different point of view, viz., by taking his visions and revelations for the starting point. A large number of instances are upon record of religious visionaries, as they are called, and ecstatical persons, who have seemed to themselves to be translated into the invisible world and to have seen and heard its inhabitants and transactions as sensibly as they could have seen and heard anything with their bodily organs. They have for the most part a strong conviction that they are under the immediate guidance and influence of spiritual beings during the disclosures made to them. The body is in many cases in a state resembling that of *catalepsy*, in which the will exercises no power over it; the expression of the eyes, though open, is extinguished; the limbs are like those of an automaton, and remain unaffected by the law of gravitation in any attitude in which they may be placed; and the face is like that of a dead person. Delitzsch, speaking with reference to St. Paul, says: "What is experienced in such ecstasies is a prelude of that separation of the soul from the body which results in death, during which separation the body is usually found in a *cataleptic* condition."

It may be questioned whether such inquiries and speculations as these, although interesting, can lead to any solid results, on account of the perfectly exceptional character of the Apostle's case. There is reason to think that no malady or bodily disorder brought about by demoniacal agency is ever identical with ordinary disease. If similarities are traceable, they are rather symptomatic than essential affinities. There are not sufficient data for determining what peculiar ingredient characteristic of Satanic malignity there was in the Apostle's affliction, but it would seem to have been something calculated to overwhelm him with ignominy rather than to excruciate him with pain. It is consolatory to know that, however hard it was to bear, the grace of Christ enabled him ultimately to rejoice and glory in it as a means whereby the power of the Lord more fully tabernacled upon him and invested him with the true strength for doing his Master's work.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

*1 He threateneth severity, and the power of his apostleship against obstinate sinners. 5 And advising them to a trial of their faith, 7 and to a reformation of their sins before his coming, 11 he concludeth his espistle with a general exhortation and a prayer.*

THIS *is* the third *time* I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.

2 I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second

---

CHAP. XIII. 1. He may be found by them not such as they wish, on account of the strict measures which he means to adopt, should his fears about them be realised. He indicates the firmness of his purpose by a sententious omission of connecting particles. "This is the third time I am coming to you." The stress lies upon the numeral, and the drift is that, having already twice experienced leniency, when he was personally present among them, they must now be prepared for sterner procedure. Both the literal purport of the words and the argument they involve imply a second visit *actually made*, because only forbearance already exercised *in fact* on two previous occasions, could shew the reasonableness of trenchant discipline on a third. As the first visit lasted a year and a half, there was, no doubt, abundant occasion for admonishing offenders of all kinds with

Digitized by Google

time; and being absent now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that, if I come again, I will not spare:

3 Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, which to you-ward is not weak, but is mighty in you.

4 For though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also are

---

long-suffering and kindness (vi. 6). He will proceed according to law against obdurate offenders, whether those described in xii. 20 or in xii. 21. "At the mouth," or "upon the statement of two **and**" (if need be) "of three witnesses every word shall be established." Trials there shall be, but strictly legal. Cognizance shall be taken of each case, but without heat or partisanship, and there shall be no condemnation without proof. Such precautions, in a strife-torn community, where false accusations were sure to abound, were most necessary. For the law of witnesses which passed, in a certain sense, from Jewish into Christian practice, see Deut. xix. 5, Matt. xviii. 16–18, John viii. 17.

**2.** That they may be fully advertised, he reminds them pointedly of one warning already given, which, as he means to act upon it, is still valid (perf. tense), and gives another in such a way as to intimate that it has the same weight as if he had administered it in person, by word of mouth, and as expressly as he did its predecessor. It is not merely the strong phrase of a letter written at a distance (x. 10) which will have to be modified in application when facts are confronted. "I **have said** beforehand and **do say** beforehand, **as** (I did) **when present the second time, so also when absent now**, to those who **were in sin before** and **to all the rest**, that, if I come again, I will not spare." The words "if I come again" leave no more doubt about his coming than the expression "if Timothy come" in 1 Cor. xvi. 10 represents Timothy's coming as doubtful. The original particle admits of being rendered in both cases by 'when,' as it does in other instances. The phrase "all the rest" seems at first sight, by its connexion with "those who were in (a state of) sin before" to denote men who had been involved in the same kind of sin, viz. immorality, yet who, inasmuch as they were not already notorious at the time of his second visit, had not been specifically warned, but are on that account warned now. If so, they would be such as had been led away by the example of the libertines, and would constitute their following. They may however be the propagators of strife (xii. 20); which would harmonise rather better with the next verse, where the Judaizers are referred to, though not exclusively. It is certain that "all the rest" of the church cannot be meant.

N. B. '*I write*' (A. V.) should not be in the text.

**3.** The reason of his meditated severity is that they *demanded* an attesting proof in energetic action of that Christ who spoke in him. Since they demanded it, they should have it. "Since ye seek a test of **the Christ that speaks** in me." The words "*in me*" are obviously emphatic, and shew that the Christ who spoke *in him* is contrasted with the Christ which spoke in the Judaizers. In accordance with their entire system, they ascribed the weakness shewn on his second visit to the Christ whom he preached and who, being not a legal, but a spiritual Christ, they said was powerless to enforce obedience to law. Thus they challenged his Christ to a proof of his power. The libertines by their defiance did the same thing, for if they did not take up the taunt of the Judaizers, they clearly counted upon the same weakness for escaping punishment altogether (1 Cor. v. 2, 6). In reply he adds with reference to his Christ: "*who towards you is not weak, but is powerful in you.*" The emphasis upon "towards you" is again the key to the thought. In Himself, in the days of His flesh and humiliation, Christ was weak, but towards those who profess His name and yet call upon Him for a proof of His power, He is, in his exaltation, not weak. On the contrary He is present and mighty amongst them, and although from long-suffering He may not put forth His strength, yet He can at any moment make it felt.

**4.** Shews that the ground upon which they scornfully based the inference of Christ's weakness does not prove it, but justifies the opposite conclusion. An essential and distinguishing characteristic of St. Paul's Christ was that He was The Crucified. This was a snare to the Jews (1 Cor. i. 23) and for the Judaizers the Crucifixion had no vital significance. Christ was to them not the crucified but the strict observer of the Law, who exacted a like observance from his followers. St. Paul's Christ, they said, shewed truly all the weakness of one crucified and lacked the strength to enforce this observance. Again, a crucified Saviour was to the Greeks foolishness (1 Cor. i. 23) and even a converted Greek, so far faithless to his Christian profession as to live in pagan immorality,

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *with him.*

weak [1]in him, but we shall live with him by the power of God toward you.

5 Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?

6 But I trust that ye shall know that we are not reprobates.

7 Now I pray to God that ye do no evil; not that we should appear

---

might think, if he did not say, that he had no need to dread the power of one who could not save himself from a malefactor's death (Luke xxiii. 35). To both the answer is complete: "for even if he was crucified out of weakness," once for all, "yet," on the other hand, "he liveth" continually "out of the power of God." A reading much better supported by external evidence than that of the Received Text, omits the conjunction 'if,' but yields a drift not essentially different:—'For crucified he was out of weakness, it is true, yet, per contra, he lives out of the power of God.' The weakness which culminated in a death suffered once for all (aor.), not only thereby ceased for ever, but was succeeded by a life coming from the power of God. In truth the death was only a passage to the life (Heb. ii. 9), and to a power which has no limit of degree, or space, or time. That this combination of weakness and power in Christ is no contradiction but a true representation, is proved by a similar union of the two states in the Apostle, who is the copy of his Master and conformed to His image in this, as in other respects (iv. 10; xii. 10). "*For we also are weak in Him, but we shall live with Him* **out of** *the power of God toward you.*" As he is in Christ, Christ's weakness is reproduced in him, and there were times when he must patiently abstain from strong measures. But on the other hand, Christ's might also took effect in him, and a time was at hand, when he would put it forth. The passage rather favours the idea (Introd. p. 378) of his having been depressed by *physical* suffering when he was in Corinth the second time. But he probably includes patience and long-suffering as an ingredient both in Christ's weakness and his own (Phil. iii. 6–8 and 2 Cor. vi. 6). Compare the wide sense of "weakness" in ch. xi. This is the only place in Scripture where weakness is ascribed to the Saviour. The stress upon "toward you" at the end of the verse points the sense of the words:—"we shall live with Him out of the power of God," which, had they stood alone, would have been thought to refer to eternal life after death.

**5.** The conduct which he threatens was in fact a tempting of Christ through unbelief. He therefore turns round with a sharply appropriate retort: "**Try** *yourselves* whether ye are in the faith; prove *yourselves*," not Christ and his organ should they bring to the test as to whether they are strong, but themselves, as to whether they are in the faith. If they are, Christ is in them, living and powerful, and they have in themselves already the proof they demand. The word for "prove" is stronger than "try," and means that the spurious is to be sifted by self-examination from the genuine within them, the dross from the gold. "**Or do ye not well know** yourselves, that Jesus Christ is in you?" You must know this "unless perchance ye are (unapproved) reprobate." They ought to see that self-testing is the right mode of obtaining the proof which they seek of Christ's power, "**or**" i.e. 'otherwise,' he must conclude that it is no part of their sure self-knowledge that Christ is in them. Yet it cannot but be a part of their self knowledge, unless perhaps they cannot stand the probation of self-examination and are not in that faith by which Christ is grasped and retained.

**6.** "But" whatever they may find about themselves, he hopes they will discover when he is brought to test that he is not unapproved, but that Christ is in him indeed with power to chastise. As hope is not quite in harmony with the painful prospect of punishing, some think that he wishes them to learn his approvedness by acting upon his present warnings, which would be a spontaneous recognition of Christ's power in him. But the original for "hope" often has a sense little differing from 'expect' and, in any case, the thing hoped for is not merely the inflicting of punishment but the effects, the vindication of his Master's power and his own, and the consequent acknowledgment of it by his readers.

**7.** His hope is one thing, but his *prayer* is that the right issue may be obtained by a better course. "**But** we pray to God that you do no evil, not in order that we **may be shewn** to be approved, but," on the contrary, "that you may do **what is good**, but we may be **as it were unapproved.**" The deprecated 'evil' cannot be the offences already committed, and the original cannot mean the *discontinuance* of evil. The sense is that ye may not produce (ποιῆσαι, aor.) evil or mischief, by making punishment inevitable. Penal discipline in a Church, however indispensable, is an evil, and there could have been no more

Digitized by Google

approved, but that ye should do that which is honest, though we be as reprobates.

8 For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.

9 For we are glad, when we are weak, and ye are strong: and this also we wish, *even* your perfection.

10 Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction.

11 Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.

---

marked illustration of this than the trouble which had followed the sentence upon the immoral offender. It is no objection whatever to this view that "what is good" in the antithetical sentence, means what is morally good, because to reform and so save the Church from such rents as sentences of excommunication is what is morally good. The object of his prayer is *not* that he may be seen to be approved, although he really would be approved in a very acceptable way by their submissive compliance with his counsels. The approvedness itself is the same as it is throughout the passage, and only differs here with regard to the mode of establishing it. Should they spare him the necessity of bringing them to order by severity, he would, in another way, remain "**as it were unapproved.**" He would not achieve a triumph of power over the contumacious, but he can forego that poor advantage because the approvedness of being voluntarily obeyed is of a higher order and involves all that he desires.

**8.** The reason why, if his prayer should be fulfilled, he would be as it were unapproved is:—"We have not any power against the truth, but for the truth." Should those who had fallen away from the true Gospel (xi. 3) return, should those who had violated the obligations of love (xii. 20) and purity (xii. 21) repent, the cause of truth, doctrinal and practical, would be thus far re-established, and his power of chastising would be nullified, because it is, in its very nature, capable of being applied only for and never against the truth.

**9.** This inability to act against the truth is corroborated by the positive joy which he feels when the weakness, which the inability implies, exists on his part and the power, which it equally implies, exists on their part. The power is that of Christ in them (v. 5) reconfirming them in their faith in the true Gospel and also enabling them to *walk* in the truth. This, prevailing in them, disarms the Apostle and he is delighted to be disarmed. "*This*," that you should be powerful and we weak, "is what we **even pray for, your amendment.**" Power after weakness is amendment, restoration or reparation. The original is used for mending torn nets, setting dislocated limbs, re-organizing a faction-rent State. How ardently he desires this restitution of order appears from his *even* praying for it, which is more than rejoicing in it and means also that it could only be brought about by God's help.

**10.** "On account of this," i.e. your amendment, "I write these things when absent, in order that, when present, I may not have to deal sharply (abruptly)." Drawing to a close of his letter he "gives these things," i.e. the menacing section of it, commencing at xii. 20, as gracious an aspect as possible, consistently with abating nothing from its strictness. He would not write to them severely from a distance (x. 10) except for the purpose of avoiding severity of action when present. With all his resolve to punish, with all the authority which the Lord gave him to punish, he will do anything rather than punish. This he expresses by repeating what he said in x. 8, that the true end for which his authority was given him was to build up and not to pull down. However necessary or beneficial chastisement may be, it is still 'a pulling down,' because it is, in the form here contemplated by him, plucking out stones, for a season at least, from the temple of the Lord. It is that evil which he prays they may not bring about (v. 7).

**11.** The conclusion of the letter, properly so called, contains a final admonition (v. 11) a parting salutation (v. 12), and the Benediction. "**As to the rest,** brethren, **rejoice, amend, exhort,** be of the same mind, be at peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you." "As to the rest," means that he has no more to say than what follows. "Brethren" seems to turn aside a little from those to whom he has first spoken so decisively and again to address the better-disposed for whom the first great section (i.–vii.) of the letter was meant. But it is more like the breadth of his character that it should comprise the entire church. It is significant, however, of the circumstances which produced this Epistle, that the title "brethren," so frequently used elsewhere and found not

Digitized by Google

12 Greet one another with an holy kiss.
13 All the saints salute you.
14 The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, *be* with you all. Amen.

---

less than nineteen times in the First Epistle, occurs only four times in the second. It is curious that whenever he uses the term rendered "as to the rest" in this sense, he always adds the word 'brethren' (Eph. vi. 10; Phil. iii. i.-v. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2; 2 Thess. iii. 1). "Rejoice." Without joy which is one of the firstfruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22) no one can be thriving in the faith. This joy had been heavily overcast in Corinth. Still the sky had brightened and as a "fellow-worker of their joy," he can now bid them sweep the shadow of the clouds from their hearts. But they can only do this by "amendment;" and a great means of securing amendment is "exhortation," practised amongst themselves. The Greek for 'being of any one's mind' means to hold by any one's party, so "be of the same mind" means that partisanship and faction are to cease. As sectarian views and feelings invariably lead to enmity, he adds the injunction "be at peace." The endeavour after religious agreement must be accompanied by an abstention from all hostility in the intercourse of life. There will thus be in and around them an element of peace and love in which God, the 'dator et amator' of both, delights to dwell and He will be with them as a helper in the good work.

**12.** The same direction as in Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20, and 1 Thess. v. 26. See notes on the first of these passages. The salutation of all the saints can only mean those of Macedonia. It would be a mere formality, if St. Paul undertook, without commission, to greet the Corinthians in the name of the saints throughout the world.

**13.** The letter finishes with the Apostolic Benediction, in its completest form, the deep and comprehensive purport of which cannot be exhausted in the notes of a commentary. The three Persons of the Trinity are invoked each to vouchsafe His presence according to His essential nature, or the part which He bears in the divine work of salvation. The second Person takes precedence, because through Him we first obtain access to God (Eph. ii. 8; iii. 12). Grace belongs to the Father, but is here ascribed especially to Christ, because through Him God's love manifested and still manifests itself in the form of unmerited favour towards men, and most signally in Christ's great act of grace or power (2 Cor. viii. 9); also because Christ is Himself "full of grace," and "out of His fulness" believers "receive grace for grace" (Jno. i. 14, 16). His grace *with us* implies conscious enjoyment of His gifts and riches (2 Cor. viii. 9) and growth to His likeness. But the fountain from which grace flows is the love of the Father, from whom cometh down every perfect gift (Jas. i. 17), and who *is* Love. God's love *with us* implies the abiding and joyful sense that we are His children and that we shall one day be like Him. See 1 Jno. iii. 1, 2. The Father has the absolute title, God, because He is "the eternal source and origin of the other two Persons," Himself neither begotten nor proceeding. The Holy Ghost is the living agent of fellowship between believers and the Father, for by the Spirit "we cry, Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6); also between believers and the Son, for "if any one hath not the spirit of Christ, this man is none of His" (Rom. viii. 9). The Spirit is also the living personal bond of that holy fellowship amongst believers themselves which is the Communion of Saints. No words could have expressed more perfectly than this sublime Benediction does the divine unity of the Church. "There is one God and Father of all . . . *who is in us all*" (Eph. iv. 6). We are all "*one body in Christ*" (Rom. xii. 5; Gal. iii. 28), and "we were *all baptized in one Spirit into one body*" (1 Cor. xii. 13). What is, if possible, of greater moment still is that our fellowship with one another is of the nature of the intercommunion between the Blessed Persons of the Trinity themselves, for Christ prayed on behalf of all that should believe on Him: "that they all may be one; as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (John xvii. 20–21).



Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# GALATIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



### § 1. Date and Occasion of this Epistle.

NO Epistle is more characteristic of St Paul than this. None bears more distinctively the impress of his personality, or proclaims its authorship more convincingly. This is true in regard to both its tone and its style. We must especially remark, in this connection, its sudden condensations of argument, its rapid alternations from severity to tenderness, and its inculcation of practical duties side by side with a high strain of doctrinal teaching. It is to be added that there is not one of St Paul's Epistles, concerning the genuineness of which less doubt has been expressed even by the most destructive critics. It has been justly remarked that he who denies its genuineness, "pronounces on himself the sentence of incapacity to distinguish false from true."

At the same time it must be admitted that this Epistle cannot be connected with a definite part of the Acts of the Apostles by the same kind of evidence as that which determines the chronology of the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Romans in connection with the facts recorded in the nineteenth chapter of the history and the early part of the twentieth. The links of person and place and circumstance, which are available in those cases, are not available in this. The evidence which determines the chronological position of the Epistle before us must be of another kind. Though, however, it cannot be anchored in its right place by the side of that narrative in the same way as those other Epistles, its true moorings can be determined in a different way; and the evidence is very strong which leads to the conviction that it was on the whole contemporary with those three Epistles, and that it is a document belonging to the memorable period of St Paul's Third Missionary Journey.

The close affinity of this Epistle with that to the Romans is manifest at first sight. Every thoughtful reader of the New Testament mentally connects these two documents together. Even on a cursory comparison of the two documents there arises a strong *primâ facie* presumption that they were written about the same time. And this impression does not rest altogether on mere identity of theological statement. An argument based on this ground might easily be pressed too far. Even in Acts xiii. 38, 39 we find a doctrinal statement regarding Justification quite as mature as anything in the Epistles. It is rather the general sequence of thought, and similarity of illustration, on which stress must be laid in considering this question. It is hardly necessary to give the more conspicuous instances: they are very obvious; and several of them are alluded to in the notes. Some of the smaller examples of resemblance between these two Epistles are perhaps of even greater weight in this argument. Thus let Rom. viii. 14—17 be verbally compared with Gal.



Digitized by Google

iv. 6, 7. The "Abba, Father" is a very remarkable point of resemblance, especially as taken in combination with the manner in which the Holy Spirit is named, and the privileges of sonship and heirdom. Again, the same texts from the Old Testament are quoted, and in the same manner. Let Rom. x. 5, for instance, be placed side by side with Gal. iii. 12. The language concerning the promises to Abraham and his seed in Rom. iv. 13, 14, 16 not only reminds us of the language on the same subject in Gal. iii. 14, 16, 29, but has all the appearance of the same train of thought, flowing almost contemporaneously in a different channel. Once more, if Rom. xi. 31, "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all," is set down in close juxtaposition with Gal. iii. 22, "the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe," there is a very striking suggestiveness in both the resemblance and the contrast. In fact there is between the letters to the Romans and Galatians a relationship very similar to, though neither so extensive nor so minute as, that which connects together the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians.

And if there is a strong presumption that this Epistle was sent to the Galatians within that well-marked period of St Paul's life in which the Epistle to the Romans was written, a further point is more than probable, viz. that the shorter of these two letters preceded the longer in its date. Hardly any commentator of note has taken a different view of this matter. There is in the letter to the Galatians all the appearance of the first vehement expression, under the urgency of a great crisis, of the religious truths which were afterwards elaborated, calmly and at length, when he wrote to the Romans. We must not indeed press this argument too far. The same truths, as was remarked in the preceding paragraph, were present in St Paul's mind at an earlier date. It would hardly be theologically correct to say that we have in the document before us the first rough sketch of that which reached its maturity in the longer document sent soon afterwards to Rome. Nor need we attempt to say how long an interval separated the times of writing the two documents, whether it was a few days or several months. All that is urged here is, that while the Epistle to the Galatians belongs to the same Pauline epoch as that to the Romans, it almost certainly preceded it in point of time.

Now if from this comparison we turn to the affinity of our Epistle with the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, we find again this affinity to be very close, but of a different kind. Here the resemblance is rather personal than argumentative. Not only are there very remarkable verbal connections between the two letters, but, what is perhaps more to the purpose, the same state of feeling is indicated on the part of the writer. If we look, as it were, into his mind, we see the same conflict, the same depression, the same vehemence, the same indignation, the same tenderness. The subjective evidence, obtained in this way, is very strong. In this respect no two Epistles of St Paul are so much alike, though in other respects they are very different. But some particulars must be given in detail.

The same state of health is not obscurely indicated in the two Epistles. There is not only the same general reference to suffering and infirmity: but in one most remarkable and specific allusion of this kind the two Epistles are found in combination. Paley says in the 'Horæ Paulinæ' (Gal. No. iv.) that "There can be no doubt but that 'the temptation which was in the flesh,' mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, and 'the thorn in the flesh, the minister of Satan to buffet him,' mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians, were intended to denote the same thing;" and he adds most truly: "In both Epistles the notice of his infirmity is suited to the place in which it is found. In the Epistle to the Corinthians the train of thought draws up to the circumstance by a regular approximation: in this Epistle it is the subject and occasion of the Epistle itself." Paley uses this coincidence as a proof of the authenticity of the Epistle to the Galatians. Here it is brought forward for another reason, *i.e.* as an argument for the belief that these two Epistles were contemporaneous. In each case St Paul not only speaks of the intensity of his

Digitized by Google

suffering, but describes it as a kind of suffering which hindered him in his work, discouraged and disheartened him, and humiliated him before others. If we look closely into his expressions in both Epistles regarding this malady, and weigh them well, we find it very reasonable to believe that at the time of writing them he was again suffering in the same way, and that both these documents were written within the range of this painful experience.

This leads to another point of comparison. In these two Epistles the same remarkable sensitiveness is displayed, as it is nowhere else; the same passion, as it were, for speaking of himself. Professor Jowett has seized upon this point of resemblance and expressed it forcibly: "In both Epistles there is a greater display of his own feelings than in any other portion of his writings, a deeper contrast of inward exaltation and outward suffering, more of personal entreaty, a greater readiness to impart himself." And the same commentator adds another point, "There is in both the same consciousness of the precarious basis on which his own authority rested in the existing state of the two Churches." If we suppose these two letters to have been written in Macedonia, at a time of extreme depression from illness, and with anxious news from Galatia and Corinth pressing on him at the same time, and moving his indignation, each Epistle gains much from this theory in the impression of its reality.

But, to come to details, there are remarkable links between these two Epistles, as regards both persons and places. In respect of *places* we must specially name Damascus and Arabia. That St Paul should have pointedly named Damascus in each of these two Epistles (2 Cor. xi. 32; Gal. i. 17), and not have mentioned the place at all in any other Epistle, is a very singular fact. We might add that in the two cases, though he mentions the place with evident feeling, he does this in connection with two very different trains of thought, and thus without any semblance of one Epistle being suggested by the other. Here the coincidence, however, is noted as an indication that the Epistles were written under the same mental impressions, and therefore probably about the same time. As regards Arabia, it must suffice to refer to the longer note at the end of the fourth chapter. The reminiscence of this region, in connection with his conversion, was evidently very fresh in the Apostle's mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal. i. 17, iv. 25); and though he does not actually name this region in the other Epistle, he virtually does so (2 Cor. xi. 32): for Aretas, whose officers kept the gates of Damascus, was king of Petra in Arabia.

The *person* on whose name it is most important to dwell in this connection is Titus (2 Cor. ii., vii., viii., xii.; Gal. ii. 1—3). In no other Epistle beyond that addressed to himself is he mentioned at all, except quite casually in 2 Tim. iv. 9. In these two Epistles he is made very prominent; and they shew that he was much in the Apostle's thoughts at the time of writing them. In the Galatians he appears as having been a close companion of the Apostle on a very memorable occasion. In the other letter his companionship at the very time of writing is made evident, with the warmest expressions of affection and confidence. That Titus should not be mentioned at all in the Acts of the Apostles[1], need cause us no difficulty. St Paul had many intimate friends, whose names find no place in that general history. This intimate friendship was a part of his personal biography; and if these two Epistles were written at the same time, and if Titus was actively engaged at this time in helping him, it is very natural that his name should appear in both, though in connection with very different trains of thought. Such a coincidence has all the air of reality.

We may turn now to various verbal links, which, as seen from our present point of view, are worthy of careful attention. Let, for instance, the manner in which St Paul speaks of his *absence* and *presence* in Gal. iv. 18, 20, and in 2 Cor. x. 1—11, xiii. 10 be compared. They not only bear the impress of the same writer, but are very like what would be written

[1] The reading "Titus Justus," which some MSS. shew in Acts xviii. 7, has no authority sufficient to justify any exception to this statement. See the Bishop of Chester's note on the passage.

Digitized by Google

by him at the same time, with a double anxiety pressing upon him. Again the catalogues of sins in Gal. v. 19—21, and in 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21, have very close resemblances, especially as regards the words "debates, envyings, wraths, strifes," in the one case, which in the original Greek are identical with the words "variance, emulation, wraths, strifes" in the other. The manner in which spiritual "sowing" and spiritual "reaping" come before us in Gal. vi. 7 is remarkably similar to what we find on the same subject in 2 Cor. ix. 6. The English Version obscures the resemblance between Gal. iv. 17 and 2 Cor. xi. 2: but in the Greek it is very close. Finally, we may note the singular use of the word "devour" in Gal. v. 15 and 2 Cor. xi. 20. This enumeration is not complete; but it is sufficient to make the argument very strong[1].

On the whole a very confident opinion may be expressed that this Epistle was written during the Third Apostolic Journey, before the Epistle to the Romans, which was sent from Corinth, and about the same time as the Second Epistle to the Corinthians,—hence that it was written in Macedonia at the time corresponding with Acts xx. 1, 2, though there is no objection to supposing that it was written at Ephesus in the later part of the "three years" (Acts xix. 8, 10, xx. 31) which immediately preceded the crossing over into Macedonia[2].

It is essential, however, that we should see how far this theory fits such direct chronological marks as we possess. Now there is nothing whatever in it to contradict them, but on the contrary some things in it which distinctly harmonize with them. Our first note of time is the fact that this Epistle was written after the first visit to Galatia (Acts xvi. 6). Next, on the assumption that the argument in the note (p. 510) is sound for identifying the journey to Jerusalem of Gal. ii. with that of Acts xv. in connection with the Council, it is evident that the Epistle was written after that occasion: to which must be added the further fact that some time must be allowed for the meeting of Peter and Paul at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11—16), which was manifestly subsequent to the Council. But further, the language of St Paul in this Epistle shews that it was written after the *second* visit to the Galatians (Acts xviii. 23). He says (Gal. iv. 13) that it was "on account of illness that he preached the Gospel to them *on the first occasion*." Hence he had been among them on more occasions than one. No other interpretation of the passage is at all natural. Thus too we reach the most natural interpretations of the following phrases—"as we said before, so say I now again" (i. 9); "I testify again to every man" (v. 3); "of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past" (v. 21); and especially, "am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (iv. 16). He could not possibly know what the effect would be of what he is now writing. Hence he must have expressed misgivings, when he had been personally among them. He probably saw at that time anxious symptoms of incipient evil, though the full news of the defection of the Galatians came upon him like a shock.

Thus by internal evidence of a different kind from the former we again bring the writing of this Epistle within the range of the Third Missionary Journey, and in general connection with the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. The only question which now remains has reference to the particular part of that journey which seems the most probable; and this depends on the interpretation of "so soon" in Gal. i. 6. At first sight we might be disposed to interpret it literally of lapse of time: and on this interpretation we should naturally fix upon the early part of the long residence in Ephe-

[1] The chief points in this argument are the doctrinal affinity of this Epistle with that to the Romans, and its personal affinity with the Second to the Corinthians. We must not fail to observe, however, that it has close resemblances to the *First* Epistle to the Corinthians, and that these add much to the force of the general argument. Of these resemblances the most remarkable are the use of the proverb "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" in 1 Cor. v. 6 and Gal. v. 9, and the use of the saying "circumcision is nothing," with a balancing contrasted phrase in 1 Cor. vii. 19 and Gal. vi. 6, 15.

[2] It ought not to be overlooked that the Bishop of Lincoln in his Commentary on the Greek New Testament, and Professor Birks in his 'Horæ Apostolicæ,' have argued carefully in favour of a different date for this Epistle. It is believed, however, by the writer of this Introduction that it contains satisfactory answers to their arguments.

Digitized by Google

sus. But really not so much a short period of time, as moral haste and want of consideration, is denoted by the phrase. See the note on the passage. Thus we are quite at liberty to bring down the writing of this Epistle to the immediate neighbourhood of the writing of the Second to the Corinthians, and to fix upon the later part of the sojourn at Ephesus, or (more probably still) the short stay at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 13) or the longer stay in Macedonia.

As regards the occasion of the writing of this Epistle, this can be very easily stated. The document in this respect speaks very clearly for itself. After St Paul had left Galatia, emissaries of the Judaizing party had come from Judæa, proclaiming that circumcision and the keeping of the Mosaic law were necessary to salvation, or at least essential to the higher Christian life, thus making Judaism an antecedent condition of Christianity: and the result had been a disastrous kind of fascination over the minds of some of the Galatian converts. At the same time, as was indeed quite essential for their purpose, these mischief-makers denied the independent apostleship of St Paul, represented him as inferior to the other Apostles, and accused him likewise of inconsistency. Thus in writing this Epistle he had two purposes in view, each essentially bound up with the other. He found it necessary on the one hand to assert and demonstrate his apostolic independence and authority, and on the other hand to re-state and to prove by argument the doctrine of free justification through faith. These things are done with great vehemence and force. The news from Galatia had startled him and filled him with anxiety. He saw what great principles were at stake, and how the whole future of Christianity was likely to be compromised. Hence there is in this Epistle an impress of severity and indignation, which we find in no other.

### § 2. History and Character of the Galatians.

Just as this Epistle has peculiar features, which belong to no others, so is there a distinctive stamp upon the Galatians themselves, in both the national and the religious sense, which we find in no other community addressed by St Paul in his Epistolary writings. We may first take note of the national characteristics of the Galatians.

The Epistle to the Galatians is really the Epistle to the Gauls. The words *Keltæ*, *Galatæ* and *Galli* are in fact only various forms of the same word. A Latin writer, speaking of the Galatians of Asia Minor, would naturally call them "Gauls;" and a Greek writer, speaking of the Gauls of France, would naturally call them "Galatians." We may give, as instances, Livy on the one hand and Polybius on the other.

The inhabitants of central Asia Minor, to whom St Paul wrote this Epistle, were an offshoot of that great Keltic migration which made itself memorable in Northern Italy and Northern Greece. After these barbarians had recoiled in confusion from the cliffs of Delphi, some of them crossed the Bosphorus, and penetrated into the region which afterwards bore their name. At the outset they were somewhat like the Turks, on their first invasion of the same district, a moveable army, encamping, marching and plundering at will. The surrounding monarchs gradually curtailed their power and repressed them within narrower limits. In the end their divided sections coalesced into one united kingdom. For a time their kings were recognised by the Romans; but in the reign of Augustus this district was made a province of the Empire, reaching from the borders of Asia and Bithynia to the neighbourhood of Iconium, Lystra and Derbe. This was the political condition of Galatia, when St Paul passed in this direction on his Second and Third Missionary Journeys.

A question here arises as to whether, when Galatia is named in the New Testament, we are to understand the term in its general popular sense, or as denoting, with a more restricted meaning, a Roman province: and this question is not very difficult to answer. Phrygia was not a Roman province: and we find this term combined with the name of Galatia on both occasions when St Paul is described in passing through this region (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23). The same remark is applicable to other geographical terms which St Luke employs

Digitized by Google

in his history of St Paul's travels through these districts, such as Lycaonia (xiv. 6—11) and Mysia (xvi. 7), which had no political import. The fact may be different in certain other cases, as when the pro-consuls of Asia (xix. 26, 38) and the jurisdiction of Cilicia (xxiii. 34) are specially named. But, on the whole, there is no reason to doubt that Galatia in the New Testament is used ethnologically and popularly, to denote a region of indefinite extent, in the middle of Asia Minor, inhabited by a people whose history was very curious, and whose character was very strongly marked.

The Keltic characteristics are not unknown to us. It may be sufficient here to quote one early and one recent writer on this subject, and then to note how far their remarks find any illustration in the Epistle to the Galatians. Cæsar, in his 'Bellum Gallicum' (IV. 5), speaks of the "infirmitas" of the Gauls, or their unsteadiness of purpose, adding "sunt in consiliis capiendis mobiles, et novis plerumque rebus student," and hence "nihil his committendum existimavit." Thierry, in his 'Histoire des Gaulois' (Pref.), sums up as follows those characteristics of the Gaulish family, which in his opinion "differentiate" it from other sections of the human race:—"une bravoure personnelle que rien n'égale chez les peuples anciens—un esprit franc, impétueux, ouvert à toutes les impressions, éminemment intelligent—mais, à côté de cela, une mobilité extrême, point de constance, une répugnance marquée aux idées de discipline et d'ordre si puissantes chez les races germaniques[1], beaucoup d'ostentation, enfin une désunion perpétuelle, fruit d'excessive vanité." We find all the features of this picture very definitely reflected in the Epistle to the Galatians—in the eager welcome which they gave to St Paul's doctrine at the first—in their enthusiastic affection towards him personally—in their readiness "so soon" to take new impressions, to throw off the Apostolic yoke and to adopt "another Gospel"—in their readiness to "bite and devour" one another—in the warnings given here by St Paul against vanity and self-conceit[2]. No careful reader of the New Testament can fail to observe that we have in this Epistle something very different, as to general features of character, from that which we find in other Epistles, as, for instance, those addressed to the Colossians and Philippians.

Another distinguishing mark of the early Galatian Christians is to be carefully noted. They are not specially identified with any great city, as is the case with Thessalonica and Corinth with respect to the early Christians of Macedonia and Achaia, but are rather spoken of as though they belonged to village communities. The chief cities of Galatia were Ancyra, Pessinus and Tavium, but none of them are named in the New Testament. The phrase used in the history is simply "the region of Galatia" (Acts xvi. 6), "the country of Galatia" (xviii. 23). The Epistle is addressed (Gal. i 2) to "the Churches of Galatia," and the very same language is used (1 Cor. xvi. 1) when the Apostle refers to them in writing to Corinth. There is no reason indeed to doubt that St Paul did visit the large towns in Galatia; and the Jews, whom we know from Josephus ('Ant.' XVI. vi. 2) to have been settled in this region, were probably for the most part in the towns.

[1] Jerome, who had been both in Galatia and in Germany, says that he found in the former country the same language spoken which he had heard in the neighbourhood of Trèves. This raises two questions; first, whether there were Germanic elements in the Gaulish horde which invaded Asia Minor, and secondly whether the language spoken on the Moselle was in that day Germanic or Keltic. It is curious to see both in the earliest and the latest of the copious series of Protestant German commentators on this Epistle a disposition to claim the Galatians as ethnologically related to them. Luther says: "Some think that the Germans are descended of the Galatians: neither is this divination perhaps untrue: for the Germans are not much unlike to them in nature: and I myself am constrained to wish to my countrymen more stedfastness and constancy: for in all things that we do, at the first brunt we be very hot, but when the heat of our affection is allayed, anon we become more slack." Bishop Lightfoot notes how Olshausen claims this Epistle as addressed to Germans and the German Luther as its great expositor. And Meyer says that "the conversion of the Galatians is the beginning of German Church history."

[2] It is possible also that in the strong mention of "drunkenness and revellings" (v. 21) there is an implied reference to the fault of intemperance, which is said by Greek and Latin writers to have been prevalent among the ancient Gauls.

Digitized by Google

But we must not fail to notice the general diffusion of Christianity, as a characteristic of this section of the earliest Church history, in contrast with its concentration in any large city.

### § 3. CONTENTS AND DOCTRINE OF THIS EPISTLE.

We may, with a very near approach to accuracy, divide this Epistle into three equal sections, each consisting of two chapters, the first containing St Paul's assertion and proof of his independent Apostolic authority, the second unfolding his argument for free justification through faith, and the third pressing home on the consciences of the Galatians injunctions to Christian duty and practice. It is true that this division is not absolutely exact: for the transition to the subject of the second section begins before the end of the first, and again this second section in some degree overlaps the third. Still the proposed arrangement is sufficiently correct for practical purposes, and it is very convenient.

I. In this section, after a severe and indignant preamble, in which he asserts that the Gospel preached by him in Galatia was immutable, he shews that the whole tenor of his life, both before and after his conversion, proved his independence of all human authority and teaching. His devotion to Judaism before his conversion was such, that only a direct Divine power could have procured that change. From Damascus he did not go, in the first instance, to Jerusalem at all; and when he did go, it was not to obtain instruction and to receive authority from those who had been "Apostles before him," but to make acquaintance with Peter[1]. At the Great Council, when the very questions were discussed, which were now at issue in Galatia, both his doctrinal teaching and his Apostolic commission were fully recognised by the very "pillars" of the Church—Peter, James and John; and afterwards, at Antioch, when the first of these three was guilty of an inconsistency of conduct, which put these principles in jeopardy, St Paul withstood him openly in the maintenance of the freedom of the Gospel. A vehement and forcible speech was then made by him, in which the main point at issue was firmly stated (ii. 14—16). Here we obtain our starting-point for the second section of the Epistle, St Paul first meeting the obvious objection to free justification, that it gives a sanction to sin, and shewing that the justified man really acquires through his union with Christ a new life of holiness (17—21).

II. St Paul now rapidly brings forward a series of brief and condensed arguments in defence of the doctrine of free justification by Grace, as opposed to justification earned through obedience to Law. And first he appeals to the experience of the Galatians. The spiritual results which came in their acceptance of the Gospel, came to them not through Law but through the operation of the Holy Spirit. Nor was this any new method on the part of God. He is one and immutable. There was in fact a rehearsal of these great principles in the patriarchal life of Abraham. They were asserted in the very nature of the promises, and there was an allegorical meaning, to this effect, in some of the very details of early Hebrew History. The Law was a parenthesis in the Divine dispensation, intended to manifest and develope the true nature of sin, and to prepare the way for the acceptance of salvation through free forgiveness. It is to be observed that in this argumentative section St Paul inserts by the way (iv. 8—20) a most earnest and affectionate appeal to the feelings and conscience of the Galatians.

III. So, conversely, in the third section, which is mainly an appeal to conscience and an instruction in duty, the argumentative part of St Paul's writing continues for a short space (v. 1—12). Justification by Law, he urges, is absolutely inconsistent with Justification by Faith. The Galatians were in the utmost danger of an absolute defection from the Gospel. For himself, he says (v. 11; cp. vi. 17), his very sufferings prove his faithfulness and consistency. But the main characteristic of these two chapters is that they contain a description of the beauty and blessedness of

[1] See the note on i. 18, and compare Canon Cook's remarks on the word ἱστορῆσαι in the Introduction to the Acts, p. 323.

Digitized by Google

the Christian life, as contrasted with that life which is a mere gratifying of the carnal nature. The strongest injunctions are given to unity of spirit, forbearance, and mutual help. For a moment, near the end (vi. 12, 13), he recurs to stern condemnation of the enemies of the Truth; but, after a warm and vehement expression of his own absolute allegiance to Christ, he concludes with the utmost tenderness of feeling towards his Galatian converts.

As regards the general doctrine[1] of this Epistle, it is an instruction for all time in the great truth that Christianity is pre-eminently a spiritual religion as opposed to a religion of mere outward observance. One point to be particularly noted is its emphatic reference to the Holy Spirit in His direct action on the human soul. The utter futility of all efforts to obtain acceptance with God by mere human exertions is urged in the most forcible language which it is possible to employ. The Law is opposed to Grace, just as the Flesh is opposed to the Spirit. Hence this Epistle has been, and is now, and will be, a storehouse of argument and admonition, on the necessity arising for making a firm stand against legal and ceremonial corruptions of Christianity.

[1] One very important particular under this head is the question whether, when St Paul is arguing in this Epistle concerning Law, he means the Mosaic Law or Law in general. On this subject reference must be made to the notes, taken in conjunction with the notes on the Ep. to the Romans.

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE

TO THE

# GALATIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

*6 He wondereth that they have so soon left him and the gospel, 8 and accurseth those that preach any other gospel than he did. 11 He learned the gospel not of men, but of God: 14 and sheweth what he was before his calling, 17 and what he did presently after it.*

PAUL, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)

1—5. OPENING SALUTATION AND DOXOLOGY.

CHAP. I. 1. *Paul, an apostle*] So far this Epistle does not differ essentially in its opening from other Epistles written by St Paul. But he passes immediately to the use of language which gives to this document a character quite unique.

*not of men, neither by man*] Here he springs at one leap to his subject. He suddenly asserts, at the very outset, that his Apostleship came neither directly nor indirectly from any human authority, but altogether and in every sense from "Jesus Christ and God the Father." No other Epistle of St Paul begins in exactly the same way. There is something of passion and indignation in the very first words. At the same time there is something of tenderness also. We must observe that there is no commendation here such as we find in the opening of the first letter to the Corinthians, in which likewise he has to express blame. It is remarkable too that there is in this preamble none of that expression of prayer and thanksgiving which is found almost everywhere else in the opening sentences of his Epistles. This letter differs in a very marked way from all the rest; and yet none is more characteristic of St Paul.

In the words immediately before us are two contrasts, first between the prepositions "of" (ἀπὸ) and "by" (διὰ), and secondly between the plural "men" and the singular "man." The first preposition refers to the ultimate origin of his appointment. This was altogether Divine. The second refers to the possibility of human instrumentality, even when the ultimate origin may be Divine. The existence of any such instrumentality in his own case he absolutely denies. The communication was made to him from Heaven; and his Apostleship was altogether independent. It might have been said of Matthias, for instance (Acts i. 21—26), that he was not an Apostle "from men," but it could not be added that he was not "through man." It could not be asserted of St Paul that there was, in any sense, any human action whatever in his appointment. As to the change of number from "men" to "man," it probably arises from this circumstance, that he is about to mention Jesus Christ. Yet it may be remarked that there is a special force in the use of the singular in this second instance. No single human being had anything to do with the placing of St Paul in the position of an Apostle.

*but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father*] No antithesis could be stronger than that which we find here between Jesus Christ on the one hand and "man" or "men" on the other. It is impossible that this language could have been used by one who believed that our Lord was a mere man. Again, we have two persons of the Trinity combined in one collective phrase, governed by one preposition. Such is the case below in *v.* 3, but with the order inverted. At first sight it might be thought that "from" (ἀπὸ) would have been a more natural preposition than "through" (διὰ) to have used in reference to the Deity. But really there is much greater emphasis in the employment of διά. The action on the Apostle's soul, in regard to his Apostleship, was without any human intervention at any point. See Acts xx. 24.

*who raised him from the dead*] This sudden mention of the Resurrection, casually and by the way, if we may so speak, shews the high place which this subject occupied in the Apostle's thoughts: and this is consistent with the doctrine of the whole body of the Apostolic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. Everywhere the Resurrection is the cardinal fact on which the assertion of the Christian revelation is made to turn. It has been thought that St Paul wished to lay stress at the outset on the fact that it was from the risen and glorified Saviour that he himself received his

Digitized by Google

2 And all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia:

3 Grace *be* to you and peace from God the Father, and *from* our Lord Jesus Christ,

4 Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this

---

call: and this need not be denied. But it is more in accordance with the Apostle's manner, if we see here one of those sudden digressions of thought and feeling, arising out of a heart full to overflowing, which are characteristic of his style. We have an instance below in the fourth verse. See the note there.

**2.** *all the brethren which are with me*] In order to conjecture with reasonable probability who these "brethren" were, it would be necessary to fix with tolerable exactitude the time and place of the writing of this Epistle. This question then properly belongs to the Introduction. Assuming that this Epistle was written during the Third Missionary Journey, these "brethren" may have included some of those who accompanied the Apostle on his return from that journey, namely, Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Timotheus, Tychicus and Trophimus, besides St Luke. See Acts xx. 4, 5. Assuming also that the writing of this letter was nearly contemporary with the writing of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, we may add the name of Titus as a probable companion. See 2 Cor. ii. 13, viii. 23, comparing Gal. ii. 1.

Another question arises in regard to this phrase in the opening part of the Epistle before us. It has been supposed that St Paul mentions the concord of his companions with himself that he may give weight to his rebuke and add authority to his teaching. This view, however, is not quite in harmony with the general tone of the Epistle, which has pre-eminently the character of individual assertion and authority. It is quite improbable that he associates his companions with himself here in the same sense as when, at the opening of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, he gives with his own name the names of Silas and Timotheus, who had laboured with him at Thessalonica. Still it was something to shew "that all the brethren" that were "with him" were one with himself in affection towards the Galatians. This phrase is a conciliatory element in the preamble of a very severe epistle.

*unto the churches of Galatia*] This language is consistent with that which he uses elsewhere on the same subject. See 1 Cor. xvi. 1. All that we know leads us to the conclusion that the Christians of Galatia were not for the most part gathered into a great city, as was the case in Macedonia, Achaia and Asia, but scattered through various communities. See the Introduction.

**3.** *Grace...and peace*] What is said elsewhere, in the notes on the Epistles, of this form of salutation is applicable here. It is singularly rich and beautiful, combining as it does Greek and Hebrew elements, and thus symbolizing the union of East and West. It is a benediction for all churches in all ages. It is not denied here to the Galatians, much as they deserved blame.

*from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ*] The second preposition ought to be wanting. We have here a collective phrase under one preposition, as above in *v.* 1. See the note there.

**4.** *Who gave himself for our sins*] This is a specimen of what have been termed St Paul's "inimitable digressions." He suddenly turns aside to mention something of which his heart is full, but the mention of which is not essential to the completion of his sentence. See note above on his reference to the Resurrection in *v.* 1. Here it is the Atonement which fills his thoughts as he names Jesus Christ. There is a marked instance of the same kind below (ii. 20) in the sentence which ends with the words "who loved me, and gave himself for me." See 1 Cor. i. 13; Eph. i. 7; Tit. ii. 14. As illustrations of this feature of St Paul's style, we may mark the words "whose I am and whom I serve" (Acts xxvii. 23) which express a world of feeling, but which appear very unexpectedly in the midst of the sentence spoken during the height of the gale

N.B. As to the preposition used here, the true reading appears to be περὶ and not ὑπέρ. On the other hand there is no doubt that ὑπὲρ is the right word in ii. 20. The correct distinction appears to be this, that περὶ is more properly applicable to the sin and ὑπὲρ to the sinner. Christ gave Himself on account of our sins and on our behalf And this distinction is observed in 1 Pet. iii. 18. On the other hand it must be noted that we find precisely the contrary usage in Heb. v. 1, 3.

*that he might deliver us from this present evil world*] The more correct rendering would be "that he **may** deliver us." The deliverance is viewed as an ever-present blessing: and this illustrates the meaning of the rest of the sentence. "The world" (αἰὼν) here is the existing state of things, considered in reference to time, rather than in reference to its constituent elements (which would require κόσμος). It denotes that which is present as opposed to that which is future, and that which is transitory as opposed to that which is eternal. And the Greek participle (ἐνεστὼς) is applied here strictly according to

Digitized by Google

present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:

5 To whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.

6 I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:

---

the analogy of its use in the New Testament. Even in 2 Thess. ii. 2 it denotes simply that which is present. In the Greek the adjective (πονηροῦ) is placed after, not before, the word to which it refers: and its force might be expressed thus: "This present world; and it is an evil world." See 1 John v. 19. Our deliverance consists partly in our pardon for our own share in the evil, and partly in strength to overcome the evil which comes to us in the form of temptation. As to the connection of this with the preceding, this deliverance rests on the atonement. Without the atonement, it could not be. And, to look at the matter from the other side, this deliverance is the end and purpose of the atonement.

*according to the will of God and our Father*] A better rendering would be **our God and Father**. See John xx. 17. St Paul in this place lays down a great principle, which he unfolds more fully afterwards. Our deliverance is entirely the result of free grace. "Paul," says Luther, "so placeth and ordereth every word, that there is not one of them but fighteth against those false apostles for the article of justification... We be not delivered by our own will or cunning, nor by our own wisdom or policy, but for that God hath taken mercy upon us and hath loved us." He so loved the world that He sent His Son to be our Saviour (John iii. 16). His will is "that all men should be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). "There is also another cause why Paul here maketh mention of the Father's will...that in Christ's words and works we should not so much look upon Him as upon the Father. For Christ came...that we by fastening our eyes upon Him, might be drawn and carried straight unto the Father."

5. *To whom be glory*] This doxology is like the "Gloria" at the end of the Psalms, by which we Christianize, as it were, those Hebrew hymns. St Paul's manner is to break out suddenly into thanksgiving, when he has had occasion to make mention of the mercy of God. See, for instance, 2 Cor. ix. 15 and Eph. iii. 20.

### 6—9. Sudden and vehement Rebuke of the Fickleness of the Galatians. The Gospel is immutable.

St Paul begins with startling vehemence. He does not approach the matter of his blame with cautious and well-considered steps, as in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. But his indignation springs out instantaneously, like a river full and copious from its very source, and flows on, carrying everything before it.

6. *I marvel*] The change which is taking place in Galatia is utterly inconceivable to the Apostle's mind. All Christian truth had been so clearly set before the Galatians, their reception of the truth had been so hearty, his own personal influence over them had been so strong, that the change seemed like some unaccountable fascination. See iii. 1.

*so soon removed*] With regard to the verb (μετατίθεσθε) used here two things must be observed, first that it is in the middle voice, and secondly that it is in the present tense. Their change of mind was a revolution in progress, and a revolution for which they were responsible. The worst results had not yet been reached: but they had allowed bad influences to distort their minds; and they were in danger of utterly losing their loyalty to the true Gospel. The verb is just that which would be used to describe a political revolution in its earlier stages, when there is serious risk of allegiance being transferred from one government to another. Thus it is employed with great exactness of the attitude of the Galatian Christians.

From the phrase "so soon" (οὕτω ταχέως) we cannot confidently infer that a very short time had passed since the Apostle left Galatia, and so obtain some guidance for approximately fixing the date of the Epistle. All such terms are relative. See the Introduction. Commentators have speculated as to the point to which the phrase "so soon" refers, whether it be the time of the conversion of the Galatians, or the time of the Apostle's last visit among them, or the time of the entry of the false teachers. But such questions really require no answer, if the words have a different meaning. And the true meaning seems to be that the Galatians were changing their position hastily and without due consideration and with no sufficient reason. So the phrase is used in 1 Tim. v. 22 and 2 Thess. ii. 2. It is to our purpose to add that this state of things was in harmony with what Cæsar tells us, to quote Tennyson's words ('In memoriam,' cix.), of "the schoolboy heat, the blind hysterics of the Celt."

*from him that called you*] This must mean either the Apostle himself or God. The latter view is most according to the analogy of St Paul's language elsewhere. See, for example, *v.* 15 below, Rom. viii. 30, and 2 Tim. i. 9. It would have attenuated the force of his argument, if St Paul had spoken of his own calling of the Galatians, as that from which they were starting aside. Their calling had been Divine:

Digitized by Google

7 Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

8 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

9 As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other

---

and it was this that made their fault and their danger so serious.

*into the grace of Christ*] The translation of the Authorized Version here is undoubtedly wrong. The preposition ἐν denotes not "into" but **in**. Free grace was the sphere in which, and the power in virtue of which, this calling had taken place. See Acts xv. 11; Eph. ii. 2; and note what is said above concerning "the will of God" in *v.* 4 of this chapter. This blessing of free grace had surrounded them, and had exerted its full power on them at the outset. Now they were despising and obliterating it.

*unto another gospel*] **a different kind of Gospel** (ἕτερον)—a modified and perverted Gospel—a Gospel of which the old characteristics were obscured and defaced. As to there being two Gospels, as to any choice of Gospels being presented to mankind, with equal claims on their attention, any such supposition is impossible. This he says in the next verse.

7. *Which is not another*] The Greek word here is a different one (ἄλλο). It is to be regretted that the A. V. conceals the relation of this to what precedes, by using the same English word to translate two different Greek words. Bishop Lightfoot discriminates between the meanings of the two words thus:—"ἄλλος *adds*, while ἕτερος *distinguishes* ... ἄλλος is generally confined to a negation of identity, ἕτερος sometimes implies the negation of resemblance." The contrast in the usage of the two words may not always have been maintained: but here and in 2 Cor. xi. 4 (ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν—εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον) it is exact.

*but there be some that trouble you*] Literally, "**unless indeed there be** some that trouble you." There was another Gospel among the Galatians *just so far as this*, that certain persons were unsettling their minds as to the true nature of the Gospel. Who the persons denoted by the vague term "some" were we do not know: and St Paul forbears to name them or to describe them more precisely. There is indignation in the very vagueness. The construction is similar to what we find in Luke xviii. 9, and Col. ii. 8. The word translated "trouble" (ταράσσοντες) is a resumption of the metaphor in μετατίθεσθε. Strictly it is a political term, applicable to the incipient stages of revolution.

*would pervert*] Literally, "are desirous of perverting." The reference is to their will and intention. They might not be ultimately and completely successful: but their plan and purpose was thoroughly bad. St Paul warns the Galatians of the motive of those who were disturbing their consistency.

8. *But though we, or an angel from heaven*] He supposes an impossibility. No stronger language could be employed for stating that the originally-communicated Gospel was absolutely immutable. Even if he himself and those who had been his associates in evangelizing Galatia (we know from Acts xv. 40, xvi. 1, 6 that these companions were Silas and Timotheus) were to contradict themselves, and to present Christianity in an altered aspect, still the old Gospel must hold its ground. If an angel were to come from heaven and present to them a modified Gospel, the mistake would be in the angel, not in what had been originally taught to the Galatians. Chrysostom suggests here that the false teachers may have pretended that they had the sanction of the older Apostles. "Don't tell me of John," he says, "don't tell me of James. If one of the highest angels were to come, corrupting the truth originally preached, he must be rejected."

*any other gospel...than that which we have preached*] The preposition (παρὰ) denotes one thing set by the side of another, so that it is seen to be palpably different from that other thing. This phrase, having some bearing on the question of tradition, has been the occasion of much controversy. The language of the whole passage is so strong, that it seems most natural to understand this phrase as precluding any deviation of any kind from the original Gospel. Those who claim the existence of a body of oral tradition co-ordinate with the written tradition of the N. T. certainly cannot gain much from this sentence.

*let him be accursed*] Here again controversy has been busy. It has been supposed that "anathema" (ἀνάθεμα) in this passage denotes ecclesiastical excommunication. But those who have wished to assign this sense to it have overlooked the fact that it would not be suitable to an angel. Nothing more surely disturbs the proportion of Scriptural truth, than the introduction into the Bible of the meanings of words which belong to a later age. The word "anathema" denotes that which is devoted to a curse, because it is hateful to God. The best commentary on the passage, so far as this word is affected, is 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

9. *As we said before*] It seems best to refer this to St Paul's recent (*i.e.* the second)

Digitized by Google

gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

10 For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

11 But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man.

12 For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught *it*, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

---

visit to Galatia. See the Introduction. Probably even then there was, in the minds of St Paul and his companions, some apprehension of fickleness: and if the same hyperbolical language was used on that occasion in the way of warning, it would be well remembered.

*If any man preach*] Rather, "If any **one** preach," so as to include the hypothesis of angels as well as men. N.B. The A. V. gives with sufficient accuracy the difference between the ἐάν τις εὐαγγελίζηται of the former verse and the εἴ τις εὐαγγελίζεται of this. In the latter case the hypothesis approaches more nearly the statement of a fact.

10. ASSERTION OF HIS OWN FREEDOM FROM TIME-SERVING AND OF HIS ABSOLUTE ALLEGIANCE TO CHRIST.

On the meaning of this difficult verse, see Additional Note at the end of the Chapter.

**10.** *For do I now persuade men, or God?*] In the second part of the sentence we must supply a verb with a different shade of meaning from "persuade." In this there is no difficulty. This is a frequent necessity in condensed writing. The question, more fully opened out, is this: "Can anyone say that the purpose of my life now is to conciliate men? Can I not truly say that my ruling desire now is to win the approbation of God?" The "for" at the beginning links this on to something which must be understood, and we can well believe that he knew that accusations of time-serving and inconsistency had been brought against him by those who were depreciating his Apostolic authority.

*if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ*] More accurately **if I were yet trying to please men.** The word "yet" requires explanation. It has been said that it cannot refer to the time before his conversion: for that then he was a cruel persecutor and inflamed with bigotry. But this state of mind is quite consistent with a keen love of human approbation: and we have abundant proofs of the sensitiveness of his nature with regard to the opinion of other men: so that it is in no way surprising, if he was conscious of having been led by this tendency into serious fault during his earlier life. See the 'Hulsean Lectures' for 1862, on the 'Character of St Paul,' 3rd ed., p. 103. The phrase "servant of Christ" is more properly "slave of Christ:" and it reminds us of vi. 17. See the note on that passage. The antithesis here between "Christ" and "men" should not be unobserved. See note on i. 1. As to the general sentiment of this part of the verse, it reiterates what was said by our Lord, that "no man can serve two masters."

11, 12. ASSERTION THAT THE GOSPEL WHICH HE PREACHED WAS MADE KNOWN TO HIM BY INDEPENDENT REVELATION.

**11.** *But I certify you, brethren*] He makes his statement now in a calmer tone. The impassioned language of indignation is left behind: and the term "brethren" is conciliatory and gentle. See iii. 15 and iv. 12. The form of expression (γνωρίζω ὑμῖν), used here to call attention to something which he is about to say of peculiar importance, is found (though variously rendered in the A. V.) in 1 Cor. xv. 1 and 2 Cor. viii. 1.

*not after man*] Not after any human fashion or mode of thought. This refers to the character of the Gospel, not to its origin. It is an important remark by Bishop Lightfoot that this phrase (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον) is confined to that chronological group of letters to which this epistle belongs. See Rom. iii. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 3, ix. 8, xv. 3.

**12.** *For I neither received it of man*] In this verse he gives a threefold proof of what he had said in the preceding verse. And first he says that he did not receive the Gospel from man. Just as he had said at the beginning of the Epistle (i. 1), that his call to the Apostleship had been without any human agency, so now he says that the revelation of the Gospel came to him without any human intervention.

There is more meaning, however, in the phrase than appears at first sight. The pronoun is emphatic: and the correct translation would be "**neither did I** receive it from men." He compares his own case with that of other Apostles, and asserts that he was at no disadvantage. If Peter or James or John received the Gospel by direct communication from Christ, so did he. It is the same assertion, though in stronger terms, as that which he makes elsewhere: "are they apostles? so am I."

*neither was I taught it*] Here is a second point, upon which he lays stress. The contrast is between progressive human teaching and direct divine revelation. There is nothing in this to forbid the belief that by successive revelations he gradually obtained full and fuller knowledge of the depths of the Gospel.

*but by the revelation of Jesus Christ*] In the

Digitized by Google

13 For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it:

14 And profited in the Jews' religion above many my [1]equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.

[1] Gr. equals in years.

---

two preceding clauses he has stated, negatively, from what sources he did not receive the Gospel. Now he states positively from whence he did receive it. The illumination came to him direct from Jesus Christ. A question still remains as to the time when this "revelation" was given: and the right answer is probably this, that it came on the way to Damascus: not however that this need exclude subsequent revelations: and especially we must think of Arabia (*v.* 17) as a probable scene of further illumination.

13—24. Historical proof that his Apostleship and Knowledge of the Gospel were independent.

He now enters deliberately upon a careful and detailed proof of the truth of the statements made above. He first points out that he had been a persecutor of the Church and notorious for his zeal in Judaism. For the conversion of such a man Divine interposition was essential (13, 14) Next he says that on his conversion he had no communication with man at all and did not go to Jerusalem (15—17). Thirdly, he says that, when he did go to Jerusalem, it was not till after three years, that he went in order to make the acquaintance of Peter, and saw only one other Apostle (18, 19). In the fourth place, after leaving Jerusalem, he was in a far-off region, and was not personally known to the Christians of Judæa, though they recognised him as a true preacher of the Gospel (21—24).

**13.** *For ye have heard*] More correctly **ye heard**. When St Paul was first in Galatia, he told them of his previous history: and they must have heard the particulars of it from other sources. He was fond of referring to the time when he had been a persecutor. See (besides 1 Cor. xv. 9, and 1 Tim. i. 13) his words before the Jewish mob (Acts xxii. 4, 5) and before Festus and Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 10, 11). In both these cases he spoke, as he writes here, under apologetic conditions: and this similarity in his manner of arguing might most correctly be termed an "undesigned coincidence."

*my conversation...in the Jews' religion*] By "conversation" is meant here "conduct" or "way of living."

St Paul has two ways of speaking of the Jewish religion, according as he makes himself a Jew to the Jew or a Gentile to the Gentile. Thus, to take the two apologetic speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, to which reference has just been made, speaking to the angry Jewish mob he says that the letters he obtained as a persecutor were for "the brethren" at Damascus, and that Ananias there was "devout according to the law" (Acts xxii. 5, 12). Speaking to Festus and Agrippa, he says that "the Jews" knew his manner of life from his youth and complains that "Jews" were his accusers (Acts xxvi. 4, 7). In the one case he speaks as if he were within the sphere of Judaism, in the other as if Judaism were external to himself. Compare a similar contrast between Rom. ix. 3, 4 and 1 Thess. ii. 15. In the two verses before us he wavers between the two methods of speaking of the Jews. "Judaism" (Ἰουδαϊσμὸς) is in itself a neutral term; and here he uses it as if it were something external to himself. He is addressing Gentile Christians, on whom Jews are exerting a mischievous influence.

*how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God*] In harmony with what has been said above we should mark how he speaks of the Christian Church as a body separate from Judaism. The language is precisely the same in 1 Cor. xv. 9.

*wasted it*] He did his best to destroy it. The same Greek word is used in Acts ix. 21. See below in this chapter *v* 23

**14.** *profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals*] More correctly **made progress in Judaism**. He has just been speaking of his persecution of Christians as a proof that Divine intervention must have been needed to make him a Christian. He now puts forward another aspect of his earlier life which was a proof of the same thing: and here he speaks of Judaism in a less hostile tone. He was distinguished among his contemporaries for religious zeal and for proficiency in legal knowledge. In this there was everything to make him a keen opponent of Christianity.

*in mine own nation*] He uses exactly the same phrase in speeches recorded in the Acts. See xxiv. 7, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 19. This is a coincidence which should not be overlooked.

*being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers*] The Greek (ὑπάρχων) denotes that he had this zeal from the outset—from his very boyhood. We find precisely the same language in Acts xxi. 20. There was a party among the Jews, which gloried in the name of "zealots," and which gave its name to one of the Twelve, Simon Zelotes. To this religious party St Paul may have belonged. As regards the word here translated "tra-

Digitized by Google

15 But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called *me* by his grace,

16 To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood:

---

dition," it is pointed out by Schaff (in Lange's 'Commentary,' p. 24) that it "embraces everything which is taught and handed down, either orally or in writing, or in both ways, from generation to generation"—that it may be used in a favourable sense, as in 1 Cor. xi. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6, or in an unfavourable one, as in Mark vii. 3, 5, 8; Col. ii. 8—that in this passage it means "the whole Jewish religion, or mode of worship, divine and human, but in the Pharisaic sense."

**15—17.** He now passes to the time which immediately succeeded his conversion. At this critical period of his life when the Christian revelation was communicated to him, and he received his call to the Apostleship, he had no communication whatever with the older Apostles. In fact he was far distant from Jerusalem, nor did he regard himself as under any necessity for going thither.

**15.** *who separated me from my mother's womb*] This version might easily be misunderstood. The meaning is that even from his birth St Paul was set apart by Divine predestination for the work to which he was appointed. So Isaiah (xlix. 1) and Jeremiah (i. 5) speak of their own predestination, even from birth, to the prophetic office. St Paul uses similar language regarding himself in Rom. i. 1. It is an essential part of his argument here that from the first moment of his existence it was God's free choice and grace that made him what he was.

*called me by his grace*] As in his predestination from the first, so in his "effectual calling," when the appointed time came, all was of God's free and gracious agency. It depended not in any way upon himself, or upon any co-operation of man. This "calling" took place on the way to Damascus. Of this we should be sure from the very nature of the case: but it is made certain by the mention of this place two verses below: "I returned again to Damascus."

**15, 16.** *when it pleased God...to reveal his Son in me*] The two points mentioned above give clear emphasis to the word here used, as this word in turn enhances their force. All the language of the passage calls our attention, as distinctly as possible, to the fact that the Divine will acted supremely in this whole matter, independently of any human plan or effort. The verb (εὐδοκέω) denotes the free and unconditioned (and, at the same time, good and gracious) will of God, operating, first, in the choosing of St Paul, and secondly, in his calling. The Apostle now passes on to a third point, the inward revelation which fitted him for the efficient discharge of his high mission. The phrase "to reveal his Son in me" is indeed capable of two interpretations. It might mean to make Christ known to the world in and through the conversion and instrumentality of St Paul. Thus it is said at the end of this chapter: "They glorified God in me." See also very similar language in 1 Tim. i. 16, where he says that he obtained mercy that "in him" a pattern of long-suffering might be shewn to all believers in after-time. And this mode of interpretation might seem preferable here, were it not for the words which immediately follow, where the communication of the Gospel to the world is declared to have been the end and purpose of the revelation in him. Hence, to avoid tautology, it seems that we must understand the phrase as meaning inward illumination. Light was given to him subjectively, in order that objectively he might be a light to others.

**16.** *that I might preach him among the heathen*] We should mark how emphatic in all accounts of the conversion is the reference to his work among the Gentiles. Thus "the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light," are named by Christ Himself in the first communication from heaven (Acts xxvi. 17, 18). To Ananias the direction is given, "Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles" (ix. 15). His own conduct was in harmony with this call. He tells Agrippa that he was "not disobedient to the heavenly vision, but promptly shewed to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God" (xxvi. 19, 20); to which we may properly add what was said to him at Jerusalem, when he first went thither from Damascus, "Depart: for I will send thee far off to the Gentiles" (xxii. 21). It should be added that "**may** preach" is the literal translation.

*immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood*] The verb (προσανατίθεσθαι) used in this place denotes the being in close conference, with the view either of obtaining or of communicating knowledge. In the latter sense it is employed in ii. 6. In the former sense here. The expression "flesh and blood" denotes man in general, with a shade of depreciation in reference to the weakness and ignorance of human nature. It is so used in four other places of the New Testament. See 1 Cor. xv. 50; Heb. ii. 14; Eph. vi. 12. The remaining passage deserves a close comparison with that before us. It was with St Paul, as with St



Digitized by Google

17 Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.

18 Then after three years I [1]went

[1] Or, returned.

Peter, when he made the great confession of his Lord's Divinity (Matt. xvi. 17), "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

**17.** *Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me*] This would obviously have been his right and natural course, if he had to derive his instruction and authority from them. As to the fact of the case, this is in harmony with what we learn elsewhere. St Luke says of his course at Damascus, "Straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues" (Acts ix. 20); and he says himself to Agrippa that he exercised his mission "first unto them of Damascus," before he did so in Jerusalem and Judæa (xxvi. 20). It is interesting to compare with this the third account of the events connected with his conversion. This was in the speech to the angry mob at Jerusalem. There it is his wisdom to adopt the course which is precisely contrary to that adopted in the Epistle to the Galatians, and to lay as much stress as possible on Jerusalem. From Acts xxii. 17 we might hastily at first sight infer, if we possessed no other information, that St Paul came instantly from Damascus to Jerusalem.

*but I went into Arabia*] We should have known nothing of this journey into Arabia, were it not for the apologetic circumstances under which this part of the Epistle to the Galatians is written. For the meaning of the word "Arabia," as to whether it is to include the Great Peninsula by the Red Sea, or to be restricted to some region near to Damascus, and for the purpose he had in view in going away into Arabia, whether it was missionary work or solitary meditation, see a longer Note at the end of Chapter IV. It may be remarked here that the contrast is very sharp between the going away into Arabia and the conferring with "flesh and blood," and that if solitude and separation from all human conference was the end he had in view, his thoughts and feelings might naturally turn to the region which was connected with the histories of Moses and Elijah. This supposition too suits the train of thought in iv. 24, 25. It is evident that the remembrance of Arabia was vividly and forcibly in his mind at the time of the writing of this Epistle.

*returned again unto Damascus*] A similar remark may be made as to the vividness of his thoughts of Damascus at this time. The place is named in a very remarkable and unexpected way in an epistle which was nearly contemporary. See 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33. Another point too must be observed, which likewise has considerable evidential value. Damascus is not named above as the place near which the supreme revelation was made to St Paul; but here the fact drops from his pen quite naturally, but unintentionally, and as it were accidentally. Paley has caught this point with his usual sagacity. "I desire it to be remarked how incidentally it appears that the affair passed at Damascus. In what may be called the direct part of the account, no mention is made of the place of his conversion at all. A casual expression at the end, and an expression brought in for a different purpose, alone fixes it to have been at Damascus. Nothing can be more like simplicity and undesignedness than this is." 'Horæ Paulinæ,' Gal. ii.

**18, 19.** He now proceeds to mention his first journey to Jerusalem, which was not made till after three years, which was undertaken for the specific purpose of making acquaintance with Peter, and which resulted in a visit lasting only about a fortnight, during which he saw only one other Apostle. With this statement it is essential to compare Acts ix. 23—30 and xxii. 17—21. The first of these passages describes the circumstances which caused St Paul to leave Damascus, the first and second together inform us of the causes why he quitted Jerusalem after his short stay in that city. These accounts must be reconciled with one another and with that which is before us; and it is important that the reconciliation should be without traces of contrivance. This will be subject of a longer Note at the end of Chapter II. Our business at present is to follow the train of St Paul's thought and argument.

**18.** *after three years*] Not till after three years. This period of time may have been three complete years, or one complete year with parts of two others. This interval corresponds with the "many days" of Acts ix. 23; and we find in the Old Testament a curious parallel, in which the same two phrases are used as synonymous. "And Shimei dwelt at Jerusalem many days; and it came to pass, at the end of three years, that two of the servants of Shimei ran away," 1 K. ii. 38, 39. The time from which St Paul reckons the three years is, doubtless, his conversion.

*I went up to Jerusalem*] See note on the preceding verse. It was a great proof of courage and stedfast will, and of confidence in the Gospel and in God, that he should have gone direct to the head-quarters of persecution, "to the very place from which he had been sent to overthrow the Christian faith."

Digitized by Google

up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.

19 But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.

20 Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.

21 Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;

22 And was unknown by face

---

*to see Peter*] From Acts ix. 22—25 we learn the external circumstances of persecution which caused St Paul to quit Damascus; and the account is confirmed by what he himself tells us in the second letter to the Corinthians (xi. 31, 32), which was nearly contemporaneous with the Epistle before us. From this passage we learn the inner motive which directed his steps toward Jerusalem. There is no inconsistency in the two statements; and it is natural that we should learn the one from the history and the other from a letter. St Paul earnestly wished to make the acquaintance of St Peter; and no wish could be more natural. The verb here employed (ἱστορῆσαι) denotes more than would appear from the English version. It means close and painstaking inquiry into that which deserves careful investigation. St Peter's character, special experience, personal recollection of Christ, work at Pentecost and in the conversion of Cornelius; these were necessarily subjects of the deepest interest to his brother Apostle.

*abode with him fifteen days*] Not long enough for tuition in the Gospel, if all knowledge of the Gospel came to St Paul through St Peter. And this is the point urged in the argument. But we, on the other hand, are bound to see something else in this meeting, though it is mentioned for a specific purpose. It was long enough for a mutual influence to be established, of great and permanent value to the Church at large. Commentators and critics have not paused on this meeting with the careful thought which it deserves. See a sermon on the subject in Canon Cook's 'Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life,' p. 228. He specially traces the influence of St Peter in St Paul's account of the resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. xv.), and the influence of St Paul on St Peter in the latter's manner of presenting the doctrine of salvation in his First Epistle.

**19.** *other of the apostles saw I none, save James*] Canon Cook sees in the mention of the special appearance to James after the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 7) a reminiscence of this intercourse at Jerusalem. Paley points out the natural and easy coincidence of this notice of James with the information derived from the Acts concerning the presence of this Apostle at Jerusalem during this period.

**20.** *behold, before God, I lie not*] St Paul confirms the veracity of his statement by a solemn oath. This is quite according to his manner, when he has serious matter in hand which must not be doubted. Compare Rom. ix. 1 and 2 Cor. i. 18.

**21—24.** He now points out that on leaving Jerusalem his life was spent for a considerable time in the far-off regions of Syria and Cilicia, in such entire separation from Palestine that the members of the Christian communities in Judæa did not even personally know him, while yet (and this addition is important) they were in thorough sympathy with him, and rejoiced that their former persecutor was now spreading the truth which he and they believed.

**21.** *Afterwards*] He does not mention the circumstances which forced him to leave Jerusalem suddenly after the short fortnight spent with St Peter. These circumstances are given partly in Acts ix. 29, 30, partly in Acts xxii. 17—21. It was not to his purpose here to name either the persecution which arose in consequence of his faithful preaching, or the command which he received during his vision in the Temple. It is enough for the present argument if he points out that the time spent in Jerusalem was very short, that he had no intercourse then with the general body of the Apostles, and that "afterwards" he was in a region very remote.

*the regions of Syria and Cilicia*] The statement in Acts ix. 30 is that "the brethren," to ensure his safety, took him down from Jerusalem to Cæsarea on the coast, and then sent him to Tarsus—from which place afterwards (xi. 25, 26) Barnabas brought him to Antioch. There is nothing in this inconsistent with what we find in this part of the Epistle to the Galatians. The phrase "Syria and Cilicia" is a generic term, which we find similarly used in Acts xv. 23, 41. The course of the range of Mount Taurus causes Cilicia to have a closer geographical affinity with northern Syria than it has with the rest of Asia Minor. Moreover Cilicia was often a political dependency of Syria. The more important name is naturally placed first. We find the word "regions" (κλίματα) used in the same vague general way in Rom. xv. 23, and 2 Cor. xi. 10. But again, these four verses cover a considerable space of time, and include the work done with Barnabas at Antioch. More important work was, in fact, done during this period in Syria than in Cilicia. The expressions of *v.* 23 (see the notes there) denote continuity of occupation on his part, with the coming of Jews to Jerusalem from time to time.

**22.** *unknown by face unto the churches of*



Digitized by Google

unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ:

23 But they had heard only, That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed.

24 And they glorified God in me.

---

*Judæa*] In Jerusalem itself he was undoubtedly well known. But he had not travelled about as a missionary in Judæa, like Philip, whom we find near Gaza and at Azotus (Acts viii. 26, 40), or like Peter, whom we find at Lydda and Joppa (ix. 35, 43). These are specimens of the places in which Christian communities were formed. We should observe how St Paul (as in *v.* 13) speaks of these communities as bodies outside of, and independent of, the Jewish Church. The remark made in this verse, says Schwoller in Lange's Commentary, "belongs also to the proof that he had not been a disciple of the Apostles; for, had he stood in near connection with them, he could not but have been known to the Churches of Judæa."

**23.** *they had heard*] This is not a correct translation of the Greek, which denotes "they **were hearing** from time to time," and is similar in form to what we find in the preceding verses, "I was unknown all the while."

*the faith*] The use of this word as a definition of Christianity is remarkable, and strikes a kind of key-note for the remainder of the Epistle.

*which once he destroyed*] He had done his best to destroy it. The Greek verb is the same as that which is translated "wasted" in *v.* 13.

**24.** *they glorified God in me*] He is careful to say that they praised not him but God. We have here an exemplification of the precept given in the Sermon on the Mount, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." For the expression "in me" see on *v.* 16. Compare Exod. xiv. 11. Meyer says here, "With the impression which Paul thus made on the congregations of Judæa the hateful plotting of the Jews in Galatia against him stood in striking contrast; hence this added clause." The primary point of the Apostle's argument is that his Christianity could not have been formed under the influence of the Apostles at Jerusalem; but a secondary point of the argument is, that in all his earlier work he had the sympathy and respect of the Christians in Judæa.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on CHAP. I. 10.

Many commentators have failed to appreciate the extreme difficulty of this verse. Assuming the ἄρτι, with which it begins, to be the same in its reference as the ἄρτι of the preceding verse, they have supposed the Apostle to mean: "Is this language which I am now using like the language of a time-server or a men-pleaser?" But surely such a sentence would be very destitute of force. Moreover in this way the ἔτι in the latter part of it would not be accounted for: nor indeed would the γὰρ at the beginning of it be easily explicable. The difficulty arises partly from the fact that a great amount of feeling is condensed into a few words, and partly from another fact, that something is taken for granted, which the Galatians would easily understand, though it must be a matter of conjecture to us. It seems probable that he had been accused of time-serving, because he had conciliated various classes of persons by becoming "all things to all men." His conscience too might tell him (and if this were so, he would certainly acknowledge it) that he had once been by no means indifferent to the favourable opinion of men.

## CHAPTER II.

*1 He sheweth when he went up again to Jerusalem, and for what purpose: 3 and that Titus was not circumcised: 11 and that he resisted Peter, and told him the reason, 14 why he and other, being Jews, do believe in Christ to be justified by faith, and not by works: 20 and that they live not in sin, who are so justified.*

---

CHAP. II. This chapter, in which St Paul pursues his historical argument, is divisible into two well-defined sections, having reference to two very marked occasions, one at Jerusalem and the other at Antioch. On the former his independent Apostleship was recognised by the other Apostles themselves (1—10), on the latter he openly resisted St Peter, when that Apostle was compromising the freedom of the Gospel by weak accommodation to Judaism. Within the first section there occurs, by the way (3—5), a collateral argument drawn by St Paul from the fact that he refused to consent to the circumcision of Titus, because, under the circumstances of the moment, this would have compromised the freedom of the

Digitized by Google

THEN fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with *me* also.

2 And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but [1] privately to them

[1] Or, *severally*.

---

Gospel. At the close of the second section (17—21) is a condensed argument on the general principles involved in the doctrine of free justification.

1—10. AT THE COUNCIL IN JERUSALEM, ST PAUL REFUSED TO CIRCUMCISE TITUS, AND HIS INDEPENDENT APOSTLESHIP WAS RECOGNISED BY THE OTHER APOSTLES.

It is assumed that this visit to Jerusalem is identical with that which is described in Acts xv. 1—35. The difficulties connected with this question are discussed in a longer note at the end of the chapter.

1. *Then fourteen years after*] A long period, he says, elapsed, during which he had no opportunity of obtaining instruction from, or acting under the influence of, other Apostles. All this time he was engaged in the work of an independent Apostleship. For the question as to the moment of time, from which these "fourteen years" are reckoned, whether it is his conversion, or the last-mentioned visit to Jerusalem, reference must be made to the longer note. The point of importance in the argument is that he was labouring in the cause of Christ many years, without any interference from the older Apostles, and without any dependence upon them.

*I went up again to Jerusalem*] For the question whether he had not been there at all since the last-mentioned visit, or whether he had not been there under circumstances which afforded an opportunity of being instructed and directed by the older Apostles, reference must again be made to the longer note. The expression "went up" denotes, as in i. 17, the going to a metropolis. As to the place from which he thus went up, it is to be presumed that it was "the regions of Syria and Cilicia." See i. 21.

*with Barnabas*] Close attention must be given to this mention of Barnabas, partly because it supplies some help towards determining the chronology of the incidents here described, partly because he had an important biographical connection with these incidents, partly because there is extreme interest in every point of association between St Paul and this friend.

*and took Titus with me also*] The occurrence of this name also must be very carefully marked. It does not appear in the narrative of the Acts at all. See note on Acts xv. 2. But his companionship with St Paul at this time, besides its relation to the topic immediately before us, is an important link of connection between this Epistle and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians which was nearly contemporary. Cp. 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 6, 13, 14, viii. 6, 16, 23, xii. 18, and see the Introduction. It seems evident that Titus was much in St Paul's mind and heart about the time when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians: and this may have quickened his recollection of what happened in reference to him on an earlier occasion.

2. *I went up by revelation*] Probably through a prophet, as in Acts xiii. 1. See Introd. to the Acts, pp. 317, 324. In this there is nothing inconsistent with what we learn from Acts xv. 2, where we are told that he was sent from Antioch to Jerusalem, in order to promote the settlement of an anxious controversy. In the history his outward commission is named, in the epistle the inward communication to himself. This is quite natural: and we have parallel cases both in i. 18 above, compared with Acts ix. 23—25, and in Acts xxii. 18 compared with Acts ix. 29, 30. In each of these cases we have an inward subjective communication on the one hand, and the pressure of outward objective circumstances on the other. Nor is it out of place here to refer to Acts x. 17, 18, 19, xi. 11, 12. The sending of messengers by Cornelius cooperated with the revelation made to St Peter's mind and conscience. And indeed it may be added that similar experience is common in the ordinary course of Christian life.

*and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles*] The persons to whom this communication was made were, of course, the Christians in Jerusalem. For the meaning of the word "communicated" (ἀνεθέμην), we should refer to Acts xxv. 14, the only other passage in the New Testament where this verb is used. There we are told that Festus laid St Paul's case before Agrippa II., with the view of careful consultation concerning it. So here St Paul (in harmony with the commission named in Acts xv. 2) laid before his fellow-Christians at Jerusalem a statement of his manner of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. We should observe that the word "preach" is in the present tense. This asserts the continuity and consistency of his manner of preaching, even to the moment of his writing this letter. See note above on εὐαγγελίζωμαι (i. 16).

*but privately to them which were of reputation*] It is to be regretted that both here and below in *v.* 6 and *v.* 9 the A. V. has changed the tense of the original. "Them which are of reputation" is the phrase which St Paul

Digitized by Google

**which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.**

**3 But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:**

---

uses. It is no part of his plan to depreciate the older Apostles, while he asserts the independence, both of his own call to be an Apostle, and of his knowledge of the Gospel. The difficulty of his position is that he must both render due honour to them and also firmly maintain his own ground; and neither of these points is overlooked in any part of his argument. That he should have privately conferred with the leading men in Jerusalem, before the public discussion of the anxious question in hand, was an indication of true wisdom; and it furnishes an example very useful to ourselves on critical occasions. The words in Acts xv. 4, "they declared what things God had done with them," are quite in harmony with all that is stated here.

*lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain*] The personality of St Paul here comes to view, in a startling manner, through the sudden use of one of his characteristic metaphors. We find the same imagery, drawn from the foot-race, in a lively form below (v. 7)—"Ye were running well: who put a sudden hindrance in your way?" Images drawn from the Greek Games, and especially the foot-race, are conspicuous in St Paul's spoken and written words, while on this Third Missionary Journey, perhaps because Corinth was much in his thoughts. See 1 Cor. ix. 24—26; Rom. ix. 16; Acts xx. 24. We find in an epistle of later date (Phil. ii. 16) the exact phrase (εἰς κενὸν τρέχειν) which is used here. To turn now from the form of St Paul's language to his motive on this occasion at Jerusalem, he acted with great caution lest his past work or his present work should be to no purpose. The nature of his apprehension seems well expressed by Bishop Lightfoot. He was anxious "lest the Judaic Christians, by insisting on the Mosaic ritual, might thwart his past and present endeavours to establish the Church on a liberal basis." A mistake in his conduct at this time might have compromised the future liberty of the Gentile churches. Moreover there was imminent risk of a schism.

3. *But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised*] He now introduces an incident, connected with the visit to Jerusalem, which, through his firmness, was made to express a great principle and resulted in benefit to the Galatian Christians themselves. Those who went with St Paul from Antioch to Jerusalem (Acts xv. 2) were probably all representatives of Gentile Christianity. Titus certainly was. That he was a man too of some mark, as to position and character, seems clear from the office which he afterwards held in Crete. See the Epistle to Titus. Strong pressure was brought to bear on St Paul to cause Titus to be circumcised. It might easily have been represented as a conciliatory act, like the making common cause with the Nazarites afterwards at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 22—24), a course which St James recommended, and which St Paul adopted. But the circumstances on this earlier occasion were peculiar. The question of the necessity of circumcision for Gentile converts had been raised. See Acts xv. 1. Before the later occasion this question had been settled for ever. This was largely due to St Paul's firmness.

As to apparent inconsistency in St Paul's conduct in comparison with what he did subsequently in the case of Timothy, the plausibility of such an accusation was probably in St Paul's mind as he wrote. He caused Timothy to be circumcised soon afterwards: and this must have been known to the Galatians, because the Apostle was then on his way to his first visit among them, and Timothy had been among them the companion of his labours. See Acts xvi. 1—3. But the two cases were very different. Titus was a pure Gentile. Timothy was half a Jew. This is perhaps one reason why so much stress is laid in the present passage on the Heathen parentage of Titus. Moreover the question of circumcision in relation to Gentile converts had been settled before the beginning of the Second Missionary Journey. Thus the two cases were as different as possible. It was quite consistent in St Paul at Lystra to circumcise Timothy "because of the Jews which were in those quarters—for they knew all that his father was a Greek," and to refuse to circumcise Titus at Jerusalem "because of false brethren," who wished to bring the Christian Church "into bondage."

But a question has been raised, and has been argued on two sides by opposing commentators, as to whether the meaning of this passage is that St Paul *refused* on this occasion, though urgently pressed, to circumcise Titus, or whether Titus really was circumcised, but only as an act of free concession and friendly arrangement, *not under any compulsion*. The original Greek would bear either interpretation. But the grammatical construction in this paragraph is peculiarly intricate: and when no help is to be gained from this source, it seems natural to decide the question by the general course of the argument. And surely the main point of the case, and the whole tone of the Epistle, require us to believe that St Paul resisted and refused. Moreover, if he

Digitized by Google

4 And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:

5 To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.

6 But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they

---

had yielded, he would have been guilty of just that kind of perilous compromise at a critical time, which he blamed so much in Peter afterwards, and which forms the subject of the second half of this chapter.

The strict meaning of the Greek here is—"**not even was Titus** compelled to be circumcised." There were strong *primâ facie* reasons for consenting. Titus was a Gentile by birth: his circumcision would have brought him into easy and satisfactory association with the Judaic Christians; and controversy for the moment would have been avoided. But St Paul knew that he was responsible for the future, and that, in order to make the future safe, he must be firm in the present.

**4.** *And that because of false brethren*] The construction is difficult: but the simplest way to understand the sentence seems to be this—that because of the mischievous influence and bad motive of these "false brethren" he refused to yield to the moral compulsion brought to bear upon him. By "false brethren" is meant Christians in name who were not Christians in principle. It is worthy of note that the word occurs only in a contemporary Epistle. See 2 Cor. xi. 26.

*unawares brought in*] This is a military metaphor. By παρείσακτος is meant one who, during war, is stealthily introduced into our camp in the guise of a friend.

*who came in privily to spy out our liberty*] The metaphorical language derived from warfare is continued (both in παρεισῆλθον and in κατασκοπῆσαι). In illustration of the former word see παρεισέδυσαν in Jude 4. The verb κατασκοπεύω, which is equivalent to the latter word, is used of the spies in Joshua ii. 2 (LXX.). The spirit of the passage is well caught by Chrysostom, who says: "See how under the image of spies he points out the nature of the warfare that was then going on."

*that they might bring us into bondage*] The true translation is "that they **may** bring us into bondage," or even more strongly "with the certain consequence that we **should have been** enslaved." St Paul always has regard to the future and to the continuity of true Gospel principles. See the end of the next verse. N.B. The reading of the best MSS. is καταδουλώσουσιν. The irregular use of the future after ἵνα (as in John xvii. 3) is very emphatic. So also is the verb itself, which denotes the bringing into utter slavery.

**5.** *To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour*] This strong language seems to shew, beyond a doubt, that the course followed by St Paul was a firm denial to yield with that submission which was so urgently claimed. The word for "subjection" has the article.

*that the truth of the gospel might continue with you*] "That it **may** continue with you" is the correct translation. St Paul points out the subsequent benefit which had resulted from his firmness at that time. His motive had been to make the future safe. And he turns here suddenly on the Galatians, with a claim for their gratitude. We may add that our own gratitude is equally due to St Paul for this service. The word translated "continue" (διαμείνῃ) is very strong, and expresses thorough continuance for ever.

**6.** *of those who seemed to be somewhat*] See note above on *v.* 2, especially as regards the tense of δοκούντων. The construction is resumed in a new form near the end of the verse, after an abrupt parenthesis. In this passage (6—10) St Paul reverts to the general narrative, after giving the episode of Titus, which may be viewed as a digression, though it has an important bearing on his argument.

*whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me*] He does not say that the other Apostles did not occupy a great position. This he fully recognises, especially as regards their having known Christ on earth: and this is probably the meaning of ποτέ, which is overlooked in the A. V. What he says is that this made no matter to him. He was independent of them.

*God accepteth no man's person*] We have here an instance of the new Christian vocabulary which came into the Greek language at this time. Appearing first in Luke xx. 31, it is very conspicuous and forcible in Acts x. 34; and it is a reasonable conjecture that St Peter used here at Jerusalem the language he had used at Cæsarea on the reception of Cornelius into the blessings of the Gospel. Instances of the same language appear in Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1, 9.

*for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me*] This resumes, with a change of construction, what we find at the beginning of the verse. For the meaning of the verb προσανέθεντο see note on i. 16. The English rendering here is very exact: nor could

Digitized by Google

who seemed *to be somewhat* in conference added nothing to me:

7 But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as *the gospel* of the circumcision *was* unto Peter;

8 (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)

9 And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we *should go* unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.

10 Only *they would* that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.

---

any language express more strongly the independent knowledge and commission of St Paul and the complete concord between him and the other Apostles. See Introd. to Acts, p. 324.

7. *when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me*] More accurately, "**is** committed." They clearly saw that St Paul had an independent commission to preach the Gospel to the Heathen. This is now no mere assertion on his part, but a recognition on theirs. The construction is similar to that in 1 Thess. ii. 4, and the tense is so chosen as to express the continuity of St Paul's responsibility and work up to the moment of his writing these words, as in i. 16 and ii. 2.

*as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter*] The two Apostles were co-ordinate in authority, each having a separate sphere of missionary work. There was no subordination of St Paul to St Peter, either in fact, or in the opinion of those who were assembled in Jerusalem on this solemn occasion. And, further, as to the division of missionary work between these two Apostles, there is often great exaggeration as to the meaning of what is stated here. On the one hand we find St Paul, after this time, when entering upon new ground, addressing himself first to the Jews. See Acts xvii. 2, xix. 8, xxviii. 17. On the other hand, to say nothing of credible tradition, we find traces of St Peter's activity at Antioch and Corinth. See 1 Cor. i. 12; Gal. ii. 11. Moreover the earliest Churches, almost everywhere, were mixed bodies; and we cannot really discriminate between their Hebrew and Heathen members. See Introduction to 1 Peter, § 3.

8. *For he that wrought effectually in Peter, &c.*] Here is given parenthetically the reason for this state of opinion; and no reason could be stronger. It was the evidence furnished by the working of God Himself. The Holy Spirit supplied His own witness. See the beginning of St Peter's first Epistle. The phrases "in Peter" and "in me" should rather be "**for** Peter" and "**for** me."

*the same was mighty in me*] It is to be regretted that the A. V. obscures the fact that the same Greek verb (*ἐνεργεῖν*) is used in both members of the sentence.

9. *James, Cephas, and John*] The order in which the names occur is not without its importance. The position in which James is placed is precisely that in which we find him in Acts xv. 13. See also Acts xii. 17, xxi. 18. Another coincidence with the Acts of the Apostles has been justly noted. It is now no longer necessary to call him "the Lord's brother," as when he is mentioned in connection with the first visit of St Paul to Jerusalem (i. 19). Since that time the other James had suffered martyrdom. See Acts xii. 1.

*who seemed to be pillars*] They had the reputation of being "pillars" of the Church, and justly. See on verses 2 and 6. No disparagement is intended. The Church is compared to a building, and the Apostles are pillars therein. Under this image a promise is given to the faithful Christian in Rev. iii. 2, and an injunction given to the Christian minister in 1 Tim. iii. 15. Using the same language Clemens Romanus speaks of St Peter and St Paul as "the greatest and most righteous pillars" of the Church.

*perceived the grace*] The language used here (*γνόντες*) seems to imply fuller and more detailed information than the *ἰδόντες* of *v.* 7. The word "grace," too, which is so carefully employed, should be noted, as involving the assertion of a great principle characteristic of this Epistle.

*the right hands of fellowship*] A personal contract was made: and there seems no reason to doubt that the right hand was used in some significant gesture on the occasion, as has been the custom in solemn agreements in all nations. If this was so, it invests the circumstances of this meeting with great life and force.

*we...unto the heathen*] These denote Paul and Barnabas.

*they unto the circumcision*] It appears then that from this time forward, John and James, like Peter, were viewed as exercising their Apostleship specially among the Jews.

10. *that we should remember the poor*] There is abundant proof that the Christians in Judæa were very poor. Such charity, coming through St Paul to them from Gentile con-

Digitized by Google

11 But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

verts to Christianity, would be more healing in its effect than many arguments.

*the same which I also was forward to do*] St Paul had previously given proof of this charitable zeal (see Acts xi. 30) as he gave proof of it at the time of writing this Epistle. See Acts xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 26, 27. In fact St Paul's mind and heart were at this time full of the subject, as we see from both Epistles to the Corinthians. Nor was this unknown to the Galatians. We learn from 1 Cor. xvi. 1, that he gave specific instructions in Galatia regarding the collection which he made on his Third Missionary Journey. Winer and others have pointed out here a correspondence with the history, which should not be overlooked. St Paul suddenly uses the singular; and we know that co-operation in this matter with Barnabas was soon after the Apostolic Council made impossible by the separation of these two companions.

11—16. PUBLIC REBUKE OF PETER, WHOSE INCONSISTENCY AT ANTIOCH COMPROMISED THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL.

Two general questions arise here, first as to the date when this conflict at Antioch took place, secondly as to the point where the expostulation of St Paul with St Peter terminates. As to the first of these questions there is really no reason for resisting the impression which this chapter makes upon us—viz. that the scene at Antioch took place after, and soon after, the Council at Jerusalem. Paley's suggestion that it may have been anterior to it arises from his mode of dealing with an imaginary difficulty. See note on *v.* 11.

Most commentators are of opinion that St Paul's speech continues from the middle of *v.* 14 to the end of the chapter. But the verses near the end have so much of a condensed argumentative character, and, so to speak, meditative character, that they seem rather to belong to the Apostle's reflective comment, than to the stern and fiery speech itself. Other commentators adopt an opposite extreme, and think that the words addressed by St Paul to St Peter are restricted to the second half of the fourteenth verse itself, and that all the remainder of the chapter is argumentative comment addressed in writing to the Galatians. But such words as "we who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles," seem clearly to be part of the direct expostulation. And, on the whole, the reasons appear strong for fixing the termination of the speech at the close of *v.* 16. There too is a most natural termination of the speech in the quotation from the hundred and forty-third psalm, a quotation which would have great force, when addressed to St Peter.

11. *But when Peter was come to Antioch*] We should note here the easy mention of Antioch, without any pains being taken to call attention to the fact that the event, now to be mentioned, occurred there. It is a parallel case to the easy mention of Damascus in i. 17. Antioch is vividly before St Paul's mind here, as Damascus was when he wrote the earlier paragraph. Assuming that this occurrence took place very soon after the Apostolic Council, we see that this fits very well with what we read in Acts xv. 30, 35, especially as regards the presence of Barnabas at Antioch. As to the reason why St Peter went to this city, on this subject we are quite in the dark.

*I withstood him to the face*] This conflict is one of the most remarkable and important events in all Church History. We see St Peter and St Paul in open antagonism: the rebuke coming from St Paul, and the blame resting unequivocally on St Peter, and this on a question very seriously affecting Christian faith and conduct in all future ages. The bearing of this on a great and momentous controversy is evident. Some, who are concerned to maintain the supreme authority, if not the infallibility, of those who are termed the successors of St Peter, and others, to whom, without being thus fettered, the notion of a conflict on a serious question between Apostles was too distasteful to be borne, have endeavoured to explain away the facts of this collision. Two different modes of doing this have been adopted, to which a brief allusion must here be made.

By Clement of Alexandria and by Eusebius in ancient times, and by the Jesuit Hardouin in later times, it has been suggested that the Cephas mentioned here is not Peter the Apostle, but some other eminent Christian disciple. This theory needs only to be stated to refute itself.

Another theory is that the conflict was a dramatic scene arranged after a mutual understanding by the two Apostles, in order that through the pretended rebuke and submission of St Peter a strong effect might be produced upon the minds of the Judaizers. It seems strange that this immoral view, first brought forward by Origen, found strong advocates in Chrysostom and Jerome. The controversy on the subject between Jerome and Augustine is one of the most famous parts of early Christian literature. Augustine not only was victorious over Jerome, but, on the whole, has commanded subsequent Christian opinion. Augustine, in one of his letters to Jerome, asks where the authority of the Scriptures is gone, if they are made to sanction deliberately-arranged falsehoods like this, referring to St Paul's words above, "Behold, before God, I

Digitized by Google

12 **For** before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.

13 And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that

lie not," and calls on his opponent to retract. This subject has received a very full treatment by Thierry, 'Saint Jérome' (1867), Vol. II. pp. 118—176.

It seems certainly very strange that St Peter should have acted as he did after the decision of the Council at Jerusalem. A difficulty on this account has been seriously felt by some commentators. Even Paley says, at the close of his remarks on this Epistle in the 'Horæ Paulinæ': "there is nothing to hinder us from supposing that the dispute at Antioch was prior to the consultation at Jerusalem, or that Peter, in consequence of this rebuke, ought to have afterwards maintained former sentiments." But we feel Peter's conduct to be equally strange, when we think of his experience at Cæsarea in the case of Cornelius. There is, in fact, no further difficulty in the matter than to suppose he was guilty of inconsistency. Such inconsistency, too, is precisely in harmony with what we read of his character in the Gospels. He bravely walked on the waves and then lost all confidence. He professed more love to Christ than the rest of the disciples and then denied his Master. Moreover we must not exaggerate his offence at Antioch, but must observe in what follows exactly what it was.

*because he was to be blamed*] The true translation is **because he was condemned.** His very conduct palpably carried its own condemnation, and this is the point of the argument which follows. Compare John iii. 18 and Rom. xiv. 23.

**12.** *before that certain came from James*] There is no reason to suppose that James had been in any way inconsistent with what he himself had said at the Council, "my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God"(Acts xv. 19). The name of James may have been used without any authority whatever: or some message or opinion of his may have been altogether perverted. The phrase "certain" (τινές), used here by St Paul, is full of indignation as in i. 7. The occasion seems to have been similar to that which had happened before the Council, as we learn from the beginning of the official letter: "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain (τινές) which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment." Acts xv. 24.

*he did eat with the Gentiles*] This was precisely what he had, after much scruple, decided to do at Cæsarea (Acts x. 28, 48), and precisely what gave occasion to his censure afterwards at Jerusalem (xi. 3); and there is no reason to doubt that this was his custom ever afterwards. The tense in the passage before us implies this. So also does the ἐθνικῶς ζῇς of *v.* 14 below.

*he withdrew and separated himself*] In two respects this is progressive in its meaning. The tense of the two verbs expresses what was gradual: and the second verb is stronger than the first. St Peter, on the arrival of these people from Jerusalem, began timidly to withdraw from his customary free intercourse with the Gentile Christians, and then absolutely discontinued it. This was the sum of his offence. This change of conduct might in itself be excused on the grounds of charity and prudence: but under the circumstances of the case, especially when his position in the Church was taken into account, it was full of the most serious danger. It arose too from a most unworthy motive.

*fearing them which were of the circumcision*] His motive was the fear to which, with all his zeal and courage, he was characteristically liable. Again we may refer to what took place on the Sea of Galilee and in the High-priest's house at Jerusalem. By "them which were of the circumcision" is meant Christians who had been Jews. These were the men who came from Jerusalem, with possibly some at Antioch who shared the same Pharisaic views.

**13.** *the other Jews dissembled likewise with him*] These were the general body of Jewish Christians at Antioch, who had hitherto lived in free intercourse with the Gentile Christians. The words "dissemble" and "dissimulation" correctly express the original Greek. Peter, and the other Jewish Christians after his example, were assuming a habit of life quite inconsistent with their true principles. The consequences were likely to be very serious. There was an imminent danger of an absolute social schism in the Church of Christ. Separation at meals might at first sight appear of no great moment. But this carried with it many other results: and especially there was the risk of separation in communicating at the Lord's Supper.

*insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away*] This mischief came like a flood in which even he was involved. The vehemence expressed in the verb (συναπήχθη) here employed by St Paul is well illustrated by its use in 2 Pet. iii. 17. The case of Barnabas is forcibly put by Bishop Lightfoot: "Even Barnabas, my own friend and colleague, who so lately had gone up to protect the interests

Digitized by Google

Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

14 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before *them* all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

15 We *who are* Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,

16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

---

of the Gentiles against the Pharisaic brethren:" and he adds, "It is not impossible that this incident, by producing a temporary feeling of distrust, may have prepared the way for the dissension between Paul and Barnabas which shortly afterwards led to their separation (Acts xv. 39). From this time forward they never appear again associated together."

**14.** *walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel*] More correctly, "walked **not in a straight path**." They deviated from the right path and walked tortuously. The words "according to the truth of the Gospel," express not the point to which the path led, but the line of its direction.

*before them all*] The collision took place on some very public occasion: and this gives to the scene greater animation and force. Bishop Ellicott refers to 1 Tim. v. 20.

*being a Jew*] The Greek means more than this, and denotes that he was "a Jew by birth, a Jew **to begin with**." We find the same phrase in Acts xvi. 20.

*livest after the manner of Gentiles*] The appeal is made to that which had been his custom hitherto. See note above on *v.* 12.

*why compellest thou*] It is true that this was only a moral compulsion: but under the circumstances of the case it was irresistible. Peter might have said that he had no desire that others should follow his example. But moral compulsion is often more weighty than any other. He not only was an Apostle, but had gone through a large and varied experience.

**15.** *We*] You and I. The point of this cannot be mistaken. Both had been Jews to begin with. Both had felt the force of hereditary prejudice. Both had overcome this prejudice. Both had upheld Christian freedom, alike in theory and in practice.

*Jews by nature*] This repeats the phrase of the preceding verse, but in a stronger form.

*not sinners of the Gentiles*] St Paul puts himself for the moment in the position of the most prejudiced Jew, uses his language, and thus makes his argument as strong as possible. Admitting to the full all the religious advantages of Judaism, and all the moral degradation of Heathenism, yet "even we" have renounced this hope of being justified through Judaism. This manner of speaking of the Heathen was customary and proverbial among the Jews. We may even refer to the language of the Sermon on the Mount. See Matt. vi. 7, 32.

**16.** *a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ*] We cannot be justified by the works of the law; in fact we cannot be justified at all, **except** through the operation of faith. This is the full and exact meaning of the sentence. When St Paul turns to speak of faith, he changes the preposition (from ἐκ to διὰ), perhaps to mark the truth that even faith is not meritorious, but only recipient. In the next verse he reverts to the preposition ἐκ. The word for "man" here is ἄνθρωπος, including every member of the human race, and repeated more strongly below in the phrase πᾶσα σάρξ.

*even we have believed in Jesus Christ*] The tense points to a definite time when Peter and Paul respectively came to the conviction that their only hope, in order to secure justification, was simply to set their faith on Jesus Christ. The force of this appeal to St Peter must have been irresistible. He had himself expressed precisely this conviction in the presence of St Paul (Acts xv. 8—11).

*for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified*] He adduces the same quotation from the hundred and forty-third Psalm as in Rom. iii. 20, and in the same form and with the same freedom. This passage was doubtless often thus used by St Paul in his argumentative preaching of the Gospel. No fitter and more pointed sentence can be imagined for the termination of his direct address to St Peter.

One reason for closing the direct address here is this, that in the next verse St Paul rebuts a theoretical objection to the general doctrine of justification, which St Peter had not impugned at all. His error had simply been a weakness and inconsistency in conduct, which tended to compromise the firm maintenance of that doctrine. St Paul at this point enters upon wider ground, as in the Epistle to the Romans, and in fact approaches that general doctrinal discussion which fills

Digitized by Google

17 But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, *is* therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

18 For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.

19 For I through the law am

---

the third and fourth chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians. To the preaching of free justification through faith without the deeds of the law it might be objected, and it probably had been objected, both at Antioch and in Galatia, that in thus abandoning the law as our hope, we in fact proclaim ourselves utter sinners, and thus make Christ, as it were, a minister not of righteousness, but of sin. To this the Apostle replies, in the first place, by an exclamation of indignant horror.

17—21. Beginning of the argument regarding free justification. An objection answered.

**17.** *while we seek to be justified by Christ*] In this eager search of ours after free justification "**in** Christ" (in union with Him by faith; for this is the correct translation) after turning our backs upon the Law, as utterly hopeless for us in this respect.

*we ourselves also are found sinners*] We, as well as the worst among the Gentiles, **were found out** to be utter sinners. This was our verdict against ourselves. This our search after free justification exposed our sin more and more; and we were obliged to confess it. (Again the tense of εὑρέθημεν should be observed, as of ἐπιστεύσαμεν above.)

*is therefore Christ the minister of sin?*] It might be urged that this process of free justification brings sin more palpably to view, and in one sense intensifies it. And this is true. St Paul does not shrink elsewhere from stating this in very strong language. See Rom. vii. 13. But if in any other sense it be suggested that Christ is "a minister of sin," such a thought must be instantly rejected with the utmost abhorrence.

*God forbid*] See Rom. iii. 31, vii. 7, 13.

**18.** *For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor*] This verse is a sentence of extreme difficulty. Perhaps that explanation of it which is the most simple and the least artificial is likely to be nearest the truth. The particle "for" introduces a reason for the position implied in the preceding exclamation. The seeking to be freely justified in Christ, though it proclaims our sin to the full, cannot constitute Him the encourager and promoter of sin. On the contrary, we constitute ourselves sinners in the worst sense if we resort to that, as the ground of our hope, which cannot remedy our sin. Each step in the rebuilding of that which, on our reception of the true Gospel, was once for all decisively pulled down, makes our transgression the more apparent. It is in this way above all others that we constitute ourselves "transgressors." (St Paul here purposely uses this stronger word. See 1 John iii. 4.) We are reverting to the law for a purpose which the law itself taught us to be hopeless. We are dishonouring the free grace of God, through which an effectual remedy for sin is attainable, and through which we ourselves have acknowledged that it can be attained. All this seems to be comprised in this condensed and comprehensive verse; and the whole is made more emphatic and invested with much feeling by the fact that St Paul personifies, as it were, the whole argument in his own experience. In support of this view we may quote the recent commentary of Prof. Sanday: "Instead of the Pauline Christian, who follows Christianity to its logical results, it is really the Judaizing Christian who stands self-condemned, and is the real sinner, in returning to what he has forsaken."

**19—21.** Bengel says of these three verses which follow that they are *summa ac medulla Christianismi*. The best help—in fact the essential help—for the understanding of these verses, in which the doctrine of Christian Justification is presented in a condensed form, is supplied by the seventh and eighth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. See the notes there.

**19.** *For I through the law am dead to the law*] The personal pronoun is, beyond any doubt, intended here to be emphatic; and for the reason of this emphatic position we must look in the context. The explanation is, in all probability, to be found in the fact that in the preceding verse he has identified the whole question with his own personal experience. Meyer gives the spirit of the emphatic "I" (ἐγώ) thus: "I for my own part, letting my own experience speak, to say nothing of the experience of others." Thus too we have the explanation of the intense personal feeling which characterises these verses. He writes eagerly from the heart, without waiting to unfold his argument at length.

As to the meaning of the phrase before us, he says that the law itself had taught him that he must utterly discard the law as the ground of justification. He had tried the experiment of being justified by the law; and the experiment had failed at every point. With every new effort the result was a deeper consciousness of sin and of helplessness. Thus he had learnt that, as to any hope of salvation from

Digitized by Google

GENERAL LIBRARY University of MICHIGAN

dead to the law, that I might live unto God.

20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

21 I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness *come* by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

---

this source, he must become dead to the law and the law to him. The force of the metaphor is seen from his use of it in other places, as when he says (Rom. vi. 2), "We are dead to sin, that we should not live any longer therein;" and again (Gal. vi. 14), "I am crucified unto the world, and the world unto me." In Rom. vii. 4, 6, we have precisely the same application of the metaphor which we find here. See the notes on these passages of the Romans.

An important question arises at this point as to whether we should understand by "law" the ceremonial law of the Jews, or law in general. Both the absence of the article and the whole stress of the argument seem decisive for the latter view. See Introd. to the Romans.

*that I might live unto God*] "That I **may** live unto God" is the correct translation. The result of the death unto the law is the new life unto God, which is to be continuous even after the discovery of the true mode of justification is reached. The thought of life out of death, under various aspects, appears constantly in St Paul's writings. See especially Rom. vi. 11, "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord;" with which we should compare 1 P ii. 24, "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead unto sin, should live unto righteousness." May we not see in this coincidence of language part of the result of that early meeting of the two Apostles (i. 18)?

Here the antithesis is between living unto the law and living unto God; and it is well put by Luther thus: "The false apostles taught this doctrine: Except thou live to the law, thou art dead to God; but Paul saith quite contrary: Except thou be dead to the law, thou canst not live to God......to live to the law is, in truth, nothing else than to die to God; and to die to the law is nothing else than to live to God."

**20.** *I am crucified with Christ*] Here St Paul uses stronger language and enters upon new ground. He has said that he is dead to the law, that it is reduced to nothingness as to any hope which it affords of salvation, and that through this death he has passed into a new life. But he could not use such language without thinking of the death and resurrection of Christ. The Lord Jesus Christ also died unto the law, but in a sense which involved our deliverance from its condemning power. In His crucifixion He exhausted the curse of the law. (See iii. 13.) He "bore our sins in His own body on the tree." In Him and with Him we are crucified. By faith we are partakers of His death. Such language is copiously used in the Epistles of St Paul. See for instance Rom. vi. 6; Col. ii. 20.

*yet not I, but Christ liveth in me*] Yet this crucifixion with Christ involves life in the highest and most glorious sense. It is, however, not his old self that lives, but his new self; or rather it is Christ that lives in him. The old man in Paul is dead, and the new man draws life direct from Christ. This short paraphrase both satisfies the conditions of the grammar and gives the general meaning.

*and the life which I now live in the flesh*] Rather, "**so far as I have a present life to live** in the flesh." The construction is the same as in Rom. vi. 10. He is obliged to feel and confess that even this high spiritual life is spent for the present under earthly conditions—with human infirmity within, and amid trials and temptations without. Still, as he proceeds to say, the sustaining principle which gives him his real life, is faith in Christ. See 2 Cor. v. 4. It is difficult to decide absolutely whether the *now* in this passage points to the past or the future. It is allowable to include both, but with special reference to the latter.

*by the faith*] More correctly, **in faith**. As Dean Alford says, ἐν πίστει corresponds to ἐν σαρκί. Faith, and not the flesh, is the real element in which I live.

*who loved me, and gave himself for me*] This sudden outburst of earnest gratitude and devotion is very characteristic. See the notes on i. 1, 4. This expression of feeling too has as much weight in his argument as any part of his reasoning has. For the use of "for" (ὑπέρ) see iii. 13; and cp. note on 1 Cor. xv. 29.

**21.** *I do not frustrate the grace of God*] This abrupt sentence says in the strongest way that to seek to be justified otherwise than simply through faith in Christ, would be to nullify the gracious gift of God, and therefore a heinous sin. Again we may quote Luther, with whom both the Apostle's sequence of thought and his sudden emotion are made alive again with extraordinary freshness. "Now he prepareth a way to the second argument of this Epistle. And here ye must diligently

Digitized by Google

consider, that to seek to be justified by works of the law, is to reject the grace of God. But, I pray you, what sin can be more execrable and horrible than to reject the grace of God, and to refuse that righteousness which cometh by Christ? It is enough and too much already that we are wicked sinners and transgressors of the commandments of God; and yet we commit moreover the most execrable of all sins, in that we do so contemptuously refuse the grace of God and remission of sins offered to us by Christ......There is no sin which Paul and the other Apostles did so much detest as the contempt of grace and denial of Christ; and yet there is no sin more common."

*then is Christ dead in vain*] Nothing could more strongly express the powerlessness of the law, and the necessity of Christ's death, for salvation. The word (δωρεὰν) translated "in vain" is not the same (εἰκῇ) which is so rendered in 1 Cor. xv. 2. The meaning is not that Christ could, under any hypothesis, have died to no purpose; but that, under this hypothesis, His death would have been unnecessary.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on CHAP. II.

### ST PAUL'S JOURNEYS TO JERUSALEM.

In consequence of the impossibility of assigning the place of this Epistle, in connection with St Paul's recorded life, by evidence of the same kind as that which gives the dates of the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians and that to the Romans, in relation to the Acts of the Apostles, it becomes the more important to mark carefully all the lines of intersection between this letter and the history. The chief lines of intersection of this kind are found in the mention which St Paul makes, in writing to the Galatians, of his journeys to Jerusalem.

Concerning the first journey there is no real difficulty. What St Luke says directly (Acts ix. 23—28), and what he quotes St Paul as saying in his apologetic speech at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 17—21), corresponds with what we read in the Epistle (Gal. i. 18—20). For the purpose of comparison we naturally take, as our starting-points, what St Paul himself says in this letter and in the speech. In the letter he says that "three years" (which may be three full years or only one year with parts of two others) passed between his conversion and his going to Jerusalem—that his motive was to make acquaintance with Peter—that he spent a fortnight with that Apostle—that the only other Apostle he saw on this occasion was James—and that on leaving Jerusalem he went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, without becoming personally known to the Christians of Judæa. In the speech he says that during this visit he was once in a trance within the precincts of the Temple, and that in this trance he received a peremptory order to quit the Holy City and to go "far thence" to the Gentiles. If now we turn to St Luke's direct account, we find that St Paul went from Damascus to Jerusalem in consequence of persecution, and under the pressure of imminent danger—that on arriving in the Holy City he was suspected—that Barnabas removed this suspicion, introduced him to the Apostles and gave them confidence—that he was with them "coming in and going out"—that in his bold mission-work he came into collision with the Hellenists—and that, in consequence of his life being in danger, he was sent away by his fellow-Christians to Cæsarea, whence he proceeded to Tarsus. In these different accounts there is no real contradiction, though they are given by different persons and under very different aspects, which circumstance results in furnishing us with much information which we should not otherwise possess. The only point on which it is reasonable to hesitate at all is the fact that St Luke, writing generally, represents St Paul as being in friendly intercourse with the Apostles and Christian brethren at Jerusalem, whereas St Paul, writing precisely and in self-defence, says that at this time he saw only two of the Apostles.

Our difficulties, if there are difficulties, arise when we come to the later visits. The Acts of the Apostles (xi. 30, xii. 25) tell us of a visit with Barnabas, on a charitable errand from Antioch; but no incidents of importance are recorded as having taken place at Jerusalem on this occasion. At first sight we might be disposed to identify with this visit that which is recorded in the second chapter of the Galatians, because of the mention of Barnabas in both instances. But the journey seems simply to have had reference to the taking of alms for the poor Christians of Judæa. Moreover it was a time of active persecution. James the brother of John was murdered about this time, and Peter was in prison. It is impossible that a free and public discussion could have taken place then on a question of theology. And, once more, the "fourteen years" of Gal. ii. 1 constitutes an insuperable objection to this identification.

It is assumed in the notes that the visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv. 1—29 is identical with that on which the Apostle lays so much stress in the letter before us (Gal. ii. 1—10). It will be proper first to point out the reasons for the identification, and then to answer some objections.

As to the identification of the journey described in these passages of the two docu-

Digitized by Google

ments, considerable stress is to be laid, in the first place, on the fact that the general colour and complexion of the occasion is in both instances the same. In each case the necessity of Jewish observances had been preached, and there was danger lest the freedom of Christianity should fall back into the bondage of Judaism: certain mischief-makers too had been at work, endeavouring to spread this corruption through the Church. The "false brethren unawares brought in" of Gal. ii. 4 correspond with those described as "certain which went out from us, subverting your souls," in Acts xv. 24. Again in each case the occasion is described as one of great moment, involving the risk of very serious consequences. In each case there is grave debate and anxiety. And to turn from the general features of the subject to points of circumstantial resemblance, the persons on each occasion are the same. In both instances Barnabas is conspicuous side by side with St Paul; and over against them, giving to them the "right hands of fellowship" (Gal. ii. 9), and recognising them as men that had "hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts xv. 26), are Peter and James. Again, those two elements of evidence, chronology and geography, which are reckoned to be the eyes of history, may be appealed to in this comparison. The "fourteen years," reckoned from St Paul's conversion, can be shewn by a very easy calculation to fit the requirements of the case exactly[1]; and as to topographical coincidences, let any one observe how in the two documents Jerusalem, Antioch, and the "regions of Syria and Cilicia" are named, and he will easily see that there is some force in this part of the argument[2]. It is very difficult to believe that there can have been, in early Apostolic history, two occasions so nearly resembling one another.

It must not however be concealed that there are some apparent difficulties in the matter. Thus it might be urged that St John is conspicuous in the description given by St Paul, whereas he is entirely absent from the narrative of St Luke. But the fact that he is not mentioned by the latter does not prove that he was not there. We need not be at all surprised if St John took no active part in the debate. But on the other hand it was of the utmost importance to St Paul's argument to state that he had the full approval and sympathy of one who was justly counted in the Church as "a pillar." Another apparent discrepancy is that Titus is not mentioned at all in the Acts, whereas circumstances connected with him are made very prominent in the Epistle. But those circumstances had a very close personal connection with St Paul and with the false accusations which were brought against him. Moreover we may very fairly say that Titus was among the "certain other," who, according to St. Luke (Acts xv. 2), went up with Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem on this business. What has been said in the Introduction regarding the presence of Titus, as forming an important evidential link between this Epistle and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, need not here be repeated. Another objection of a different kind has weighed forcibly with some writers. It is asked, if the two occasions were the same, why St Paul made no reference to the decree of the Council, which was decisive against the necessity of circumcision. To this question the answer is that St Paul, in writing to the Galatians, appealed to general principles and to his own independent apostolic authority. Moreover the decrees of the Council were in certain aspects provisional. And, again, there are passages in other Epistles of St Paul, where it is still more remarkable at first sight that he did not quote these decrees. Three other objections may be named, which can be dismissed very briefly. In Acts xv. it is said that St Paul was sent by the Church from Antioch to Jerusalem; in Gal. ii. 1 he says himself that he went "by revelation." But there is no discrepancy here. The two documents give us, each according to its own spirit and intention, two aspects of the matter. Again it may be urged that the private communications with "them which were of reputation," so pointedly named by St Paul (Gal. ii. 2), find no place in the narrative of the Acts. But such private communications would be the natural and necessary preparation for a successful public conference; and it was very important for St Paul to shew how friendly his relations were throughout with the other Apostles. Moreover in Acts xv. 4—7 there are clear indications of manifold discussion. Finally, a difficulty has been felt by some, because the second journey named in the Acts is not mentioned at all in the Galatians, and because St Paul seems to say there that he never went to Jerusalem at all between the first visit and the third. But he does not really say so. It

[1] Reckoning back from A.D. 60, at the accession of Festus, when St Paul was sent to Rome, we find that the Council at Jerusalem must have been held about 50 or 51; and the same date is given, taking the "fourteen years" to mean really thirteen, if we reckon forward from A.D. 37, when St Paul was converted and Aretas was in possession of Damascus.

[2] One minor point under this head is worthy of notice. The term "Syria and Cilicia" is a popular collective phrase for those regions round Antioch and Tarsus, which had a close geographical affinity with one another. See 'Life and Epistles of St Paul,' end of Ch. III. The phrase occurs both in the Epistle and in the Acts in connection with this general period of St Paul's life, but not at the same precise points of his life. Cp. Acts xv. 23, 41, and Gal. i. 21. Hence there can have been no copying in either direction. There is correspondence without contrivance.

Digitized by Google

is not his purpose to enumerate all his journeys to Jerusalem, but merely to specify all the occasions when it might be conceived possible that he had been in such communication with the other Apostles, as to have received his instruction in Christianity from them. And we have seen that no such opportunity could have been afforded on the second visit.

Thus there is no reason why we should suppose, with some writers, that the visit to Jerusalem described in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians was one which is not mentioned in the Acts at all: whether, with Paley, we place it between the visit at the close of the First Missionary Journey (Acts xv. 2), and the visit at the close of the Second (Acts xviii. 22), or, with Schrader, we place it between the latter and the last recorded visit of all, at the close of the Third Missionary Journey (Acts xxi. 17).

Nor is there any good reason for identifying it with the former of these two occasions (*i.e.* the visit between the Second and Third Missionary Expeditions), though we have the eminent name of Wieseler in favour of this hypothesis. St Paul, in writing to the Galatians, could not have passed over so important a meeting as that which is recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts; and St Luke, in his history, could not have passed over so important a meeting as that which is recorded in the second chapter of the Galatians. Moreover from the time of the beginning of the Second Missionary Expedition Barnabas had ceased to be the close companion of St Paul.

The last visit of all (Acts xxi. 17) is clearly out of the question in this connection; for, so far from any opportunity being then given for theological discussion, St Paul was violently apprehended, and became a prisoner, in which condition he remained more than two years.

It is not superfluous to add that the view advocated in this note is also that of by far the greater number of the most careful modern commentators, and that superficial discrepancies, in a case of this kind, if only they can be satisfactorily explained, become very valuable as indications that the documents under comparison are independent of one another, so that their substantial agreement proves the truthfulness of both.

---

## CHAPTER III.

1 *He asketh what moved them to leave the faith, and hang upon the law?* 6 *They that believe are justified,* 9 *and blessed with Abraham.* 10 *And this he sheweth by many reasons.*

O FOOLISH Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?

---

CHAP. III. The central or polemical part of the Epistle begins at this point. Its commencement appears very abrupt: but in fact the polemical ground has been entered upon in the account of the disputation with St Peter; and the vehement spirit in which St Paul wrote there communicates the same spirit to the beginning of this new paragraph.

1—6. INDIGNANT EXPOSTULATION WITH THE GALATIANS ON THEIR FALLING AWAY FROM THEIR HIGH PRIVILEGE.

*O foolish Galatians*] There is no reference here, as Jerome supposes, to any national or natural stupidity of the Galatians, but rather the contrary. They had abundant intelligence, but they had not made proper use of it. Such a view too would be quite out of harmony with St Paul's customary courtesy.

*who hath bewitched you*] The "you" is emphatic; and the reason for the emphasis is given in what follows. The translation of the verb (ἐβάσκανεν) is very exact. Good illustrations of the use of the word are supplied by the Septuagint: Wisd. iv. 12; Ecclus. xiv. 8. It was as if some one with an "evil eye" had exerted a disastrous charm upon them and withdrawn their gaze from that which they ought to have contemplated with unceasing satisfaction and joy.

*that ye should not obey the truth*] These words should not be here. On this point the authority of the MSS. is decisive. Perhaps the words have crept into the Received Text from ch. v. 7.

*before whose eyes*] Whatever might be the case with others, in the Galatians this sudden change was utterly irrational. The Crucified Christ had been so distinctly and forcibly set before them, as to have been almost visible.

*set forth, crucified among you*] The clear preaching and revelation of Christ had been among the Galatians like a placard on the walls. This term exactly expresses the meaning of προεγράφη. The Crucified Saviour had been so displayed among them, as to be visible, so to speak, at every turn. See in illustration of this meaning 1 Macc. x. 36 and Jude 4. Bishop Ellicott gives the sense of the appeal thus: "Who could have bewitched you with his gaze, when you had only to fix your eyes on Christ to escape the fascination?" and he compares Num. xxi. 9. The phrase "among you," if it is genuine, repeats in another form the words "before whose eyes," and must be connected with "set forth," not with "crucified." It ought

Digitized by Google

2 This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

3 Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?

4 Have ye suffered [1]so many things in vain? if *it be* yet in vain.

5 He therefore that ministereth to

[1] Or, *so great.*

---

to be added, however, that the state of the MSS. makes it doubtful, to say the least, whether the phrase ought to be here. We must observe the stress laid on "crucified." It was not simply Jesus Christ, but Jesus Christ on the Cross, that had been so distinctly set before the minds and hearts of the Galatians. Professor Jowett suggests that there is an echo here of ii. 20.

**2—5. Their own past experience proved that they were wrong now.**

First he appeals to them on the ground of their religious experience. They were themselves well aware that the spiritual power which came to them was acquired not through any observance of Law, but simply through reception of the Gospel orally delivered. The third and fourth verses are of the nature of a parenthesis; but the whole paragraph hangs together as one forcible argument.

**2.** *This only*] For the moment, he says, I will leave on one side all other arguments and will appeal to you on this ground only. It may also be implied that what he now refers to is the strongest ground of all. Their own experience ought to have been decisive of the whole question. It is the same reasoning as that of St Peter in the case of Cornelius. See Acts xi. 15—17, xv. 8, 9.

*Received ye the Spirit*] "Such mighty strength," says Chrysostom. See *v.* 5. A question arises here as to whether "the Spirit" here denotes miraculous power or moral power or both. It seems best to understand the phrase as quite comprehensive. The word δυνάμεις in the fifth verse turns our thoughts distinctly towards that which is miraculous: and again we may refer to the analogy of the case of Cornelius.

*by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith*] The "works of the law and the hearing of faith" are contrasted as sharply as possible; and the contrast appears identically in this verse and the fifth. Unless we understand the reference to be to law in general, the contrast is attenuated. It is essential that we refer here to the Epistle to the Romans, especially Rom. i. 5 and xvi. 26. The phrase before us comprises in its meaning (objectively) the preaching which addresses itself to faith, and (subjectively) that hearing of the heart which is the result of faith in that which is preached.

**3.** *Are ye so foolish?*] Are ye so senseless as to act thus? The same word is repeated with which he began at the opening of the section.

*having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?*] The contrast here is between the Spirit and the Flesh. But this is quite in harmony with the preceding contrast between the Spirit and the Law. To seek to be justified by Law is a following of that human nature which is in opposition to true spiritual life. See Rom. viii. 4, 8, 9. For the Galatians the starting-point of their Christian life had been distinctly spiritual. Now they were attempting to bring their Christian life to more maturity by a discarded and utterly useless method.

There is a further point to be observed in the language of this verse. It seems to be a metaphor taken from the Greek mysteries. They had been correctly initiated, and now they were perfecting themselves on a wrong method.

**4.** *Have ye suffered so many things in vain?*] This is another appeal to their experience, made parenthetically. For the pure Gospel, as originally presented to them, they had undergone great sufferings. Now, if the Gospel was to be altogether changed in its character and principles, those sufferings would have lost their meaning. They might have been avoided. No account of the actual sufferings of the Galatian Christians is given in the New Testament. But the narrative of St Paul's work in Galatia is very brief: and it is a matter of course that the Christians there would be called to tribulation, as at Antioch in Pisidia, for instance (Acts xiv. 22), and at Thessalonica (1 Thess. i. 6).

*if it be yet in vain*] Or rather, "if it be **even** in vain." Two significations are possible here. St Paul may mean that he cannot conceive it possible that all they had gone through should be in vain: he was confident that they would come to a better mind and would return to their old principles. But he may also mean that if these sufferings were to prove "in vain," they would be worse than "in vain:" the most disastrous consequences might be expected to follow. This second meaning is more forcible and less commonplace, and on these accounts is to be preferred. "O wenn auch nur umsonst!" is Ewald's vigorous translation. 'Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus,' p. 76.

**5.** *He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit*] According to all the analogy of St Paul's writings, it is God Himself that is here denoted. The use of the present tense should be marked. St Paul assumes that there has been a continuous supply of grace and power



Digitized by Google

you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, *doeth he it* by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

6 Even as Abraham believed God, and it was [1] accounted to him for righteousness.

[1] Or, *imputed.*

7 Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

8 And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, *saying*, [a] In thee shall all nations be blessed.

[a] Gen. 12. 3.

9 So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.

10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, [b] Cursed *is* every

[b] Deut. 27. 26.

---

to the Galatians. It is to be added that the verb employed here (ἐπιχορηγῶν) conveys the idea of richness and bounty. See Phil. i. 19.

**6.** *Even as Abraham believed God*] Here first occurs that mention of Abraham, which gives so strongly marked a character to this Epistle. The original religious principle of the Galatians was the same with that of Abraham. It was Faith as opposed to Law. Abraham's case was not in contrast to the mere Jewish Law, for that law did not then exist.

*it was accounted to him for righteousness*] Gen. xv. 6. This is one of the cardinal passages of the Bible. It is quoted likewise in Rom iv. 3, 9, 21, 22, and in James ii. 23.

**7—9.** THE PARALLEL BETWEEN ABRAHAM'S FAITH AND CHRISTIAN FAITH STATED AT LENGTH.

**7.** *Know ye therefore*] It is difficult to decide whether the verb (γινώσκετε) in this place is indicative or imperative. Perhaps the imperative accords best with the didactic character of this part of the Epistle; and it is certainly most in harmony with grammatical usage. It is a question of no great moment: for the practical sense of the passage is the same on either view.

*they which are of faith*] They to whom Faith, and not Law, is the primordial principle and ruling power of their religious life. We find in Rom. iv. 10, οἱ ἐκ νόμου as the direct antithesis to οἱ ἐκ πίστεως.

*the same*] They and no others (οὗτοι).

*children of Abraham*] See Rom. iv. 11, 16.

**8.** *the scripture, foreseeing*] This is the strongest and most vivid personification of the Old Testament which is to be found in the New. The Scripture is here spoken of as a living thing, instinct with prophetic power. It means far more than it appears to mean at first sight. "Quid vidit Scriptura?" is a form of expression found in the Rabbinical writings. A question indeed arises as to whether "Scripture" (γραφή) here means the Old Testament as a whole, or only the particular passage cited. It seems to be true that the plural (γραφαί) is commonly used when the whole volume is intended. But here and in *v.* 22, though the word is in the singular, the wider view appears more suitable: and with us the "Scripture" and the "Scriptures" are interchangeable, and τὰ βιβλία is become "the Bible."

*that God would justify the heathen through faith*] This is not accurately translated. More correctly it would be "that God **justifieth the nations** through faith," a special stress being laid on the word "faith." See *v.* 11, where the rendering is correct. A broad general principle, of universal and perpetual application, is laid down. The phrase (τὰ ἔθνη), though elsewhere it is narrowed in meaning, so as to denote the Heathen as opposed to the Jews, has here no such restriction, but is quite comprehensive. Immediately below πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is used collectively of the whole human race, as the equivalent of "all families of the earth" in Gen. xii. 3.

*preached before the gospel unto Abraham*] Communicated to him by anticipation the great principle of the universal Gospel. Bishop Lightfoot says: "The promise to Abraham was an anticipation of the Gospel, not only as announcing the Messiah, but also as involving the doctrine of righteousness by faith."

*In thee shall all nations be blessed*] Abraham was, in a spiritual sense, the father of all believers. The quotation is from Gen. xii. 3. But with this must be combined xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4; and indeed in the Apostle's thought all these passages are blended together. If we compare them in the LXX. we find πάντα τὰ ἔθνη used as synonymous with πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί. See the first paragraph of this note.

**9.** *blessed with faithful Abraham*] Here "blessed" is viewed as coincident in meaning with "justified." In this place we have "with" instead of "in." All the faithful are bound up with Abraham "in one communion and fellowship."

**10—14.** ARGUMENTATIVE CONFIRMATION OF THE PREVIOUS STATEMENT.

**10.** *as many as are of the works of the law*] The emphatic comprehensiveness of this should be marked. For the meaning see note above on οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, *v.* 7.

*under the curse*] They not only fail of

Digitized by Google

one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

11 But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, *it is* evident: for, [c]The just shall live by faith.

[c] Hab. 2. 4. Rom. 1. 17.

12 And the law is not of faith: but, [d]The man that doeth them shall live in them.

[d] Lev 18. 5.

13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, [e]Cursed *is* every one that hangeth on a tree:

[e] Deut 21. 23.

14 That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

---

reaching the blessing, but are involved in a curse. The confirmatory passage quoted below is from Deut. xxvii. 26. See Rom. iii. 19, 20. It is implied that no one can keep the law. In the very nature of the case the curse is inevitable to him who seeks justification through mere obedience to Law. For the form of expression see "under sin" (ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν), Rom. iii. 9. We should observe that here too "curse" (κατάρα) is in the abstract and without the article.

*for it is written*] This frequent and pointed quoting of Scripture is to be connected with the fact that the Judaizers were in the habit of quoting it. The Apostle brings forward passages which contain great cardinal principles; and it is to be added that this quotation, like the former, is connected with a memorable passage of Hebrew history, viz. with the delivery of the curses and blessings on Mounts Ebal and Gerizim. It is to be observed that the Apostle, in quoting, intensifies the original. Justin ('Trypho,' § 95), adduces the passage in exactly the same form.

**11.** *by the law*] Literally **in law**—within the sphere of law.

*evident*] A new reason is now given. Such a mode of seeking righteousness is manifestly contrary to what is said in another memorable and cardinal passage of Scripture. Then follows the famous quotation from Habak. ii. 4, which we find likewise in Rom. i. 17 (where see note) and Heb. x. 38.

**12.** *the law is not of faith*] There is an absolute contrariety between the principles represented respectively by Law and Faith. The same antithesis is expressed in Rom. xi. 6 thus: "If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work."

*The man that doeth them shall live in them*] This quotation is from Lev. xviii. 5, and is found likewise in Rom. x. 5 in a similar argument. The very principle of justification by Law is not believing, but doing. The word "them" means "my statutes and my judgments." St Paul assumes that his readers, who are familiar with the Old Testament, will supply these words. The phrase "in them" is well paraphrased by Winer, "Ut in his legibus vitæ fons quasi insit."

**13.** *Christ hath redeemed us*] A joyful contrast. The "us" is emphatic. In this pronoun St Paul includes both the Galatians and himself. He says, not "hath redeemed," but **redeemed**, the tense referring to a definite time, *i.e.* the time of the crucifixion. In that crucifixion Christ bought us out of the condition of "curse." The other passages where this verb occurs in the N. T. are iv. 5; Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5.

*being made a curse for us*] This expresses the mode by which the great change was effected. He took the curse on Himself on our behalf and in our place. It is to be observed, on the one hand, that "curse" (κατάρα) is without the article, thus covering the whole ground of the disadvantage and condemnation under which we lay, and on the other hand that St Paul does not say, in the words of the original quotation, that Christ was "cursed and separated by God" (κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ).

*Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*] Deut. xxi. 23.

**14.** *That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles*] Here perhaps "Gentiles" (ἔθνη) is used in the more restricted sense. See note on *v.* 8. And yet this is not quite certain. See how large the statemnet is in the following clause.

*that we might receive*] This is certainly comprehensive of all. In the construction of this sentence it is not easy to determine whether the second clause is subordinate to the first, or co-ordinate with it. Nor is the question of much moment. "The Apostle advances with his subject," till in these closing words of the paragraph he expresses in the largest terms the blessing accorded to faith.

*the promise of the Spirit through faith*] It is doubly important to note this language carefully. The words refer us back to *vv.* 2 and 5, and thus give cohesion to the whole passage. Doctrinally too we observe that the blessing accorded to faith is summed up in the receiving of the Holy Spirit.



Digitized by Google

15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though *it be* but a man's [1]covenant, yet *if it be* confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

16 Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

17 And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of

[1] Or, *testament.*

---

15—18. THE GIVING OF THE LAW DID NOT ABROGATE THE PROMISE.

The incompatibility of Law and Faith as methods of seeking salvation having been thus broadly laid down, it becomes necessary to deal with the fact of the giving of the Mosaic Law. St Paul insists, using a common illustration from human life, that this giving of the Law could not possibly have been the abrogation of the Promise.

**15.** *Brethren*] Here he suddenly begins in a very different and more tender tone. See the notes on vi. 1 and vi. 18.

*I speak after the manner of men*] I use an illustration from common experience. I speak of heavenly things in a human manner.

*Though it be but a man's covenant*] Yet even in the case of a mere human covenant no change is made, after it is ratified, except by the consent of both parties. Much has been written on the construction of this sentence: but it seems best to take it in this simple way.

*disannulleth, or addeth*] There are two ways of invalidating a covenant, either by absolutely setting it aside or by introducing new conditions. The point of the Apostle's argument is that in neither way did the giving of the Law invalidate the primary laying down of the Gospel principle of salvation through faith in a promise.

**16.** *the promises*] Here the number is changed from the singular to the plural. The promise was given to Abraham on more occasions than one, and under varying circumstances. See Gen. xii. 7, xv. 5, 18, xvii. 7, 8, xxii. 18. This fact adds very much to the force of the Apostle's argument in taking this communication to Abraham as his starting-point, and as the enunciation of a great permanent principle.

*He saith not*] *i.e.* God, from Whom the promise came, or the Scripture, where the promise is recorded. Either view is quite in harmony with St Paul's usage.

*not...as of many; but as of one*] The Jews were apt to suppose that the promise was amply fulfilled in the various members of their own nationality. See John viii. 33, 37. But the Apostle sees in the promise something far beyond the mere Jews, however numerous and however widely scattered. He sees in it that deep unity which comprehends all mankind. If its fulfilment were merely in the diffused and separate Jews, this deep unity would be broken. The whole force of the fulfilment is concentrated in CHRIST: and the more it is concentrated in Him, the more comprehensive and universal is its meaning.

Thus the question whether by "seed" (σπέρμα) the Apostle means Christ simply, or Christ including His Church, is really no question at all. In an argument of this kind the two are inseparable. One side of the subject, indeed, is chiefly presented in this place, where attention is directed to CHRIST as the centre of the fulfilment of the promise. It is through Christ, and Christ only, that the blessing comes to mankind. The other aspect of the subject is presented to us in those two concluding verses of the chapter, which it is essential to combine with the verse now before us. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Compare Heb. ii. 16 and the concluding words of the *Magnificat*, Luke i. 55.

Much life and force are given to this argumentation, if we remember that St Paul himself was a child of Abraham, and that his mind, from early youth, had been deeply imbued with questions of this kind. It is highly interesting and instructive to see how he brings back all Christianity, as it were, into the focus prepared by the promise given to Abraham.

It cannot be denied indeed that there is great difficulty in this passage: and some would cut the knot of the difficulty by saying that St Paul is merely arguing according to the Rabbinical method in which he had been trained, and in accommodation to the habits of thought of those against whom he is contending. We need not deny that we have here a reflection of his early Rabbinical training, and that he is glad to take his opponents on their own ground. But those who believe that both the Old Testament, on the one hand, and the Apostle Paul, on the other, were instinct with a Divine inspiration, will feel it to be more reverent and more true to believe in a higher explanation. St Paul uses a verbal fact: but his argument rises high above the mere verbal fact: and this leads us to believe that there is more in the mere words of Genesis, as quoted in this place, than meets the eye at first sight.

**17.** *this I say*] This is what I mean. He returns to the point he was beginning to state in *v.* 15.

Digitized by Google

God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.

18 For if the inheritance *be* of the law, *it is* no more of promise: but God gave *it* to Abraham by promise.

19 Wherefore then *serveth* the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; *and it was* ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.

20 Now a mediator is not *a mediator* of one, but God is one.

---

*four hundred and thirty years*] See Gen. xv. 13; Exod. xii. 40, 41; Acts vii. 6, and the notes on those passages. The absolute number of years is of no moment in this argument. The point is that a covenant had been previously ratified by God and could not be altered by anything subsequent.

**18.** *if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise*] The phrase "no more" is simply logical, not having any reference to time. St Paul sums up in a simple antithesis all he has said in this paragraph. Law and Promise are mutually exclusive, just as Law and Faith are mutually exclusive. The antithesis in fact is the same, except that in the one case it is expressed on God's side, in the other on man's side. See *v.* 11 and the Epistle to the Romans as quoted there.

**19—24.** THE TRUE MEANING OF THE MOSAIC LAW.

It is not enough to say that a subsequent law cannot invalidate or modify a previous promise. The Law itself was Divinely given; and the Apostle is bound to state what the import of the Law is.

**19.** *It was added*] Not as a supplement to the covenant, but as a distinct and temporary institution, and to prepare the way to the fulfilment of the promise.

*because of transgressions*] To reveal sin in its true character, to intensify and make manifest its evil, or, in Milton's words, quoted by Bishop Wordsworth: "Therefore Law was given them to evince their natural pravity," so that when they see that "Law can discover sin but not remove," they may seek some better righteousness. See ii. 18, and especially Rom. v. 13—20, vii. 7. The other meaning, which some commentators have preferred, viz. that the Law was given to restrain and hinder transgressions, does not at all fit the case, and is quite contrary to the whole argument, alike in this Epistle and in the Epistle to the Romans. We see indeed from such Psalms as the nineteenth and hundred and nineteenth what the spiritual training of the Law is to the devout soul which has faith. But the Law *per se* tends rather to stimulate moral evil than to check it, unless the spiritual principle of Faith be present. "The strength of Sin is the Law." Even for the keeping of the Law we need a higher principle than any which the Law itself provides.

*ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator*] St Paul has already said that the purpose of the Law was restricted and that in duration it was temporary and provisional. It was added "because of transgressions," and it was to last only "until the Seed should come" unto Whom the universal promise was made. It was in fact a parenthesis in the Divine dispensations. Now the Apostle names two other characteristics in which the Law was inferior to the Gospel. First it was not given directly, but through the intervention of angels, and secondly it was placed in the hands of a mediator, who is Moses. St Paul, like St Stephen (Acts vii. 53), accepts the view which was held by the Jews and which we find in Josephus (a view, let it be added, which seems amply justified by Deut. xxxiii. 2), that the Law was given through the instrumentality of angels. Cp. Heb. ii. 2. As to the fact that Moses was a "mediator," this is made very conspicuous in the Old Testament. See especially Deut. v. 5. The Rabbinical writers often give this title to him. It is quite true also that Christ is a Mediator. But this question does not enter into the present comparison, which is between the directness and universality of the Promise and the provisional nature of the Law. The mediatorial work of Christ is altogether outside of the argument before us.

**20.** *Now a mediator is not...of one, but God is one*] The interpretation of this verse is one of the curiosities of Biblical literature. The explanations are reckoned by hundreds. But in fact, if we look at the matter simply and naturally, the difficulty of the passage does not appear very great. At all events there are passages in this Epistle of far greater difficulty. The contrast is between Mediation and Promise. Now Mediation implies separation, divergence and the existence of two parties: whereas Promise is a simple direct transaction which admits of no such intervention. In the case of the giving of the Law the Hebrew People were on one side and God on the other, and Moses between. In the case of the Promise the Giver was isolated and alone, and dealt singly and directly with Abraham.

So far the explanation seems simple and reasonable, if we take the word "one" in the two

Digitized by Google

21 *Is* the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.

22 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

23 But before faith came, we were

---

parts of the sentence as merely numerical. But in fact we are not bound to take the meaning of the word in the second part in precisely the same sense as in the first. As the contrast is being drawn between the mediation of Moses on the one hand, and the absolute giving of the Gospel promise on the other, the thought passes into a higher region. We are reminded that not merely in the latter case is there no division, no separation, but there is *no change* in God's method of dealing with man, as regards the matter of salvation. It is not so much the unity of God, as His *immutability* which we now contemplate. The first meaning of the word "one" has shaded off into the other. God is ever ONE AND THE SAME. With Him is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." We might take the Hebrew sentence "the Lord our God is one Lord," as an illustration of what is before us. But this merely contrasts the unity of God with polytheism; whereas the point to which we are brought in this verse is rather unity, as opposed to variation, in God's character and purpose; and the best Scriptural illustration of the meaning is to be found in the New Testament, where St Paul says (Rom. iii. 29), "Is God of the Jews only? Is He not of the Gentiles also? yea, of the Gentiles also; for God is ONE, who will justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision by faith."

In confirmation of this general view, permission is given to quote from an independent and earlier comment in an unpublished sermon by the Rev. Canon Evans of Durham: "Some two or three hundred interpretations go upon the misconception that the meaning is, A mediator is a mediator, not of one party, but of two parties, and God is one of those two parties. This is, I strongly think, quite erroneous. The structure of the Greek excludes it. The word *one* clearly points not to *number*, but to *quality:* and so the sense will be: A mediator has nothing to do with what is one, whatsoever be the number of individuals constituting that *unit*, but God is pre-eminently ONE,—one with Himself, as in essence, so in will...one in His one method of dealing with all."

**21—24.** OBJECTION ANSWERED THAT THE LAW CONTRADICTS THE PROMISE.

An obvious objection arises here that the Law, though Divinely given, is antagonistic to and contradictory of the Divinely given promise. After repelling the supposition as profane, the Apostle argues the point on principle. The Law is not contradictory to the Gospel, but different in its nature and purpose. This he illustrates by two metaphors, one from a prison which keeps men in ward and safety, one from the slave-tutor, who takes care of the child till the time of his free sonship is come.

**21.** *God forbid*] Any thought of inconsistency in God's dispensations towards mankind is indignantly repelled by St Paul in the use of the formula customary with him in such cases. See ii. 17, vi. 14; Rom. ix. 14; 1 Cor. vi. 15.

*if there had been a law given which could have given life*] Alford says well here that "give life" (ζωοποιῆσαι) "takes for granted that we by nature are *dead* in trespasses and sins." The point of the argument is that salvation through Law is an absolute impossibility. Not that God's law is in fault, but man's sin. The Law in itself is, as is said in the Epistle to the Romans, "holy, and just, and good."

*verily*] Indeed and in truth: not as some foolishly fancied and falsely taught, but in reality. See Matt. xix. 17.

**22.** Every word of this verse, one by one, falls with clear and telling force. It is perfect, as a statement of the reality of human sin, and of the doctrine of free salvation.

*the scripture*] The personification is similar to that in *v.* 8. Bengel has an interesting remark here on the fact that it is "the Scripture" not "the Law" which is said to have this effect in regard to sin. It was not when the Promise was given, but when the Law was given, that the writing of Scripture began. "Deus etiam sine scripto stat promissis, sed peccatoris perfidiam per literam redargui opus fuit."

*concluded all under sin*] The same language is used in Rom. xi. 32; and the similarity of language is an illustration of the fact that these two Epistles were nearly contemporaneous. The word (συνέκλεισεν) denotes **shut up together**, and it introduces the metaphor of the prison which follows. It also prepares the way for the declaration of freedom which at the close of the chapter comes in contrast. The neuter (τὰ πάντα) enhances, if possible, the comprehensiveness of the statement. It is not only coextensive with the human race, but excludes every kind of human motive and attempt.

Digitized by Google

kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.

24 Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

25 But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

---

**23.** *kept under the law, shut up*] The expression "shut up" is used here to render the same word as "concluded" above. The word (ἐφρουρούμεθα) translated "kept" is very strong, and implies two particulars: (1) bondage, (2) reservation for a time of coming freedom.

*which should afterwards be revealed*] This expresses strongly the certainty of the ultimate fulfilment of the promise.

**24.** *the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ*] This image is distinct from the former, though it arises out of it. The word "schoolmaster" in this passage conveys a wrong impression to the English reader. The person so designated (παιδαγωγὸς) was a slave, whose office it was to take care of the boy and to keep him from moral and physical harm in his earlier years. One of his express duties was to take the boy to the house of the schoolmaster (see Plato 'Lysis' § 12 and Hor. 'Sat.' I. vi. 81, where he says that his father himself took care of him during his attendance at school, on which Orelli says: "Non servus pædagogus: oderat enim pater triste illud pædagogorum genus"): and it is difficult to believe that this was altogether absent from the mind of the Apostle, as he wrote this sentence. Christ is our great Teacher (διδάσκαλος), and the Law takes us to Him that we may be taught. Still this is not the main point in the present instance. The chief thought is that of full freedom and sonship as connected with Christ.

**25—29.** The glorious freedom of the Gospel contrasted with the preceding description of bondage under the Law.

**25.** *we are*] In the next verse he says "ye are." There is a similar interchange in 1 Thess. v. 5. Perhaps the Apostle wishes, by this sudden change of person, to assure the Galatians of the privileges they already possess to the full, and to shew them the folly of seeking to improve their spiritual position by a recurrence to the Law. At all events they had "in Christ Jesus" all that he had.

**26.** *all*] This absolutely comprehensive language, which continues the same thought, is very characteristic of St Paul. Compare the "as many" of the next verse.

*children of God*] Better, **sons**. The word is no longer "child" (παῖς), involved in παιδαγωγός, but "son" (υἱός), which expresses the full liberty and dignity of sonship. Moreover the phrase is no longer "sons of Abraham," but "sons of God." Thus the privilege rises high above that which was indicated in *v.* 7.

**27.** *put on Christ*] Luther has an energetic passage here on the high honour set by St Paul on the Sacrament of Baptism. It is far more than a mere token of admission into the number of Christians. And yet we must distinguish between the possession of a spiritual advantage and the conscious use of it. St Paul says elsewhere (Rom. xiii. 14) to baptized Christians, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." As regards the use of the Greek verb (ἐνδύεσθαι), Bishop Ellicott remarks that it denotes "the complete assumption of the nature of another," and quotes Calvin as saying that in Baptism we "bear before God the name and person of Christ, and are reckoned as being in Him rather than in ourselves."

**28.** *There is*] As regards spiritual privileges none of the three distinctions here enumerated are possible. For the construction of οὐκ ἔνι see James i. 17.

*neither Jew nor Greek*] This sweeps away all thought of nationality, as regards religion, in the presence of Christianity. See Rom. x. 12, where the same truth is stated more fully. The word "Greek" (Ἕλλην), in these places and in ii. 3 above, is used generally for "Gentile" in its contrast with "Jew."

*neither bond nor free*] We should not pass this by without pausing to note that it is practically the proclaiming of emancipation to the slave. All social distinctions, as regards religion, are abolished in the presence of Christianity. Add to the establishment of this principle the participation in the Eucharist, on equal terms, by slaves and their masters: and it is evident that in due time Slavery must vanish before the progress of the Gospel.

*neither male nor female*] In the same way it is to be observed here that the establishment of this principle led inevitably to the high

Digitized by Google

29 And if ye *be* Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

## CHAPTER IV.

*1 We were under the law till Christ came, as the heir is under his guardian till he be of age. 5 But Christ freed us from the law: 7 therefore we are servants no longer to it. 14 He remembereth their good will to him, and his to them, 22 and sheweth that we are the sons of Abraham by the freewoman.*

NOW I say, *That* the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all;

2 But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father.

3 Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the [1] elements of the world:

[1] Or, *rudiments.*

---

position which Woman has attained under Christianity. Two things are to be observed in this third couplet of contrasted words. The use of the neuter gives to the phrase a large generalisation. Moreover here καὶ is employed instead of οὐδε. The distinctions between Jew and Gentile, and between slave and free, are conventional, and, so to speak, accidental. The distinction between man and woman is neither national nor social, but inherent in the very nature of things. Their essential union is recognised in the use of the ancient sacred formula (Gen. i. 27; Mark x. 6). Yet even thus there is equality and independence, as to the possession of religious privilege.

*all one*] One person, as it were. The word in the Greek is masculine, not neuter. See Eph. ii. 15.

**29.** *then are ye Abraham's seed*] See note on *v.* 16. Here the other side is presented to us of that organically-united whole, Christ and His Church.

*and heirs according to the promise*] The word "and" is wanting in the best MSS., and its absence gives additional strength to the passage. The word "heir" furnishes the starting-point of the next paragraphs. The word "promise" concludes the paragraphs, in which it has been used so often, and with so much beauty and force.

CHAP. IV. 1—7. JUDAISM IS LIKE THE POSITION OF A MINOR WHO HAS NOT REACHED THE PRIVILEGE OF SONSHIP.

St Paul here illustrates the same truth by an image drawn from the position of an heir who is yet a minor, the image being suddenly suggested, if we may so say, by the last clause of the preceding paragraph.

**1.** *Now I say*] He proceeds to make his meaning clearer by a new comparison.

*the heir*] The phrase is used generically, like "the Mediator" (according to the correct translation) in iii. 20.

*a child*] The meaning here is, "a minor." The question has been raised as to whether the provisions of the Roman law or of the Jewish law are here in view. It is probably most in harmony with the correct mode of commenting on this passage not to raise the question at all. The analogy rests entirely on general principles.

*differeth nothing from a servant*] Nay, says Erasmus, referring to the παιδαγωγὸς of the preceding chapter, he is actually subject to a slave.

*lord of all*] Potentially he is in this position (see the 'Lay of the Last Minstrel,' III. 20, "If thou art the son of such a man, and ever comest to thy command"). We touch here another question which has been raised in reference to this parable, viz. whether the father is supposed to be living or dead. In the very nature of the case he is presumed to be dead; and if we meet a difficulty in some part of the comparison, we must remember that no Scriptural analogy of this kind is to be pressed too closely.

**2.** *under tutors and governors*] The former having reference to his person, the latter to his property. The former might be expressed by the word "guardians," the latter by the word "stewards."

*the time appointed of the father*] The time previously defined by him, before he died. Of course, on the spiritual side of the comparison, the Father never dies. So at a certain point in the Gospel-parables of the Unjust Judge and the Midnight Traveller, the resemblance ceases and becomes contrast.

**3.** *we*] Including both St Paul and those who had been Jews, on the one hand, and such as the Galatians, on the other. This is evident from what follows.

*were in bondage*] In the Greek the verbal connection is as close as possible between this and the word "servant" above; and indeed it is difficult to believe that a faint thought of the παιδαγωγὸς is not lingering in this place.

*under the elements of the world*] See Col. ii. 8 and 20, where precisely the same phrase is used. It seems to denote "the elementary lessons of outward things" (Conybeare in 'Life and Epistles of St Paul'), the mere rudimentary alphabet of religion. The Jewish religion, and, in a certain sense, all heathen religions too, had this relation to the full revelation of

Digitized by Google

4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,

5 To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

6 And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

7 Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

8 Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.

9 But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye [1]again to the weak and beggarly [1]elements,

[1] Or, *back.*
[1] Or, *rudiments.*

---

the Gospel. It is obvious that there is a mixture of metaphors in the passage. Many of the Fathers referred this phrase to the physical elements, especially the heavenly bodies as regulating religious seasons. But the word "we" limits it to something applicable to the Jews.

4. *the fulness of the time*] Equivalent to "the time appointed of the father" above—the time ordained in the counsels of God, the Law meanwhile having done its work.

*sent forth*] More accurately **sent forth from Himself.** The phrase is very exact and full. It is of high theological importance to note that precisely the same verb is used below (*v.* 6) of the sending of the Spirit.

*made of a woman, made under the law*] In the fullest sense Christ shared our humanity and came under our legal conditions. In the Greek there is no article in either clause.

5. *To redeem*] How this redemption was effected is not here explained: but it was explained above iii. 13.

*them that were under the law*] Again in the Greek there is no article.

*that we might receive*] Once more in the word "we" the utmost comprehensiveness is expressed. See note above on *v.* 3. The word "receive" denotes that this great privilege came to us without any work or deserving of our own.

6. *sent forth*] See note on *v.* 4.

*crying, Abba, Father*] In a nearly contemporary epistle we have a parallel passage (Rom. viii. 15) which should be examined with the utmost care in close connection with that before us. In the first place we have in both the remarkable word "crying," which denotes intense earnestness in prayer. Next the Spirit, through which the Christian thus prays, is called in the Romans "the Spirit of adoption." But above all we have there also the remarkable phrase "Abba Father" (found likewise in Mark xiv. 36). This combination of Semitic and Greek elements (which may be compared with the combination of "grace" and "peace" in the Apostolic salutation) illustrates with great beauty the Christian sense of the universal fatherhood of God. As to the actual use of the phrase, it was probably part of some customary liturgical prayer.

7. *Wherefore thou*] He has already turned from "we" to "ye;" and now by using "thou" he gives a closer point still to his argument and exhortation.

*if a son, then an heir*] See Rom. viii. 17, "If children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ." This minute similarity of language, in a nearly contemporary epistle, should be very carefully observed.

*heir of God through Christ*] There seems no doubt that the correct reading here is simply **heir through God**, *i.e.* in virtue of His goodness and free promise only; and this form is in harmony with what immediately follows, where the word "God" is three times repeated.

8—11. THIS CHANGE IN THE GALATIAN MIND WAS A RELAPSE INTO AN OBSOLETE SYSTEM.

In disregard of these high privileges, the Galatians were reverting to a rudimentary state of things, which could do them no spiritual good, and were turning into nought the Apostle's mission.

8. *did service*] The verbal connection in the original is as close as possible between this and "servant" and "bondage."

*which by nature are no gods*] The Authorised Version here is better than the Received Text. A certain stress is laid on the words "by nature." These gods in the very nature of things are non-existent; and this is St Paul's language in 1 Cor. viii. 4, x. 19, 20.

9. *after that ye have known God*] The Authorised Version, in using the same English word "know," conceals the fact that here and in the preceding verse a different Greek verb is used. In the latter instance the knowledge denoted is of a more intimate and perfect kind, "having attained to a recognition of Him."

*or rather are known of God*] "Having received the privilege of His recognition." Cp. 1 Cor. viii. 3. Dean Alford says very justly, "This made their fall from Him the more matter of indignant appeal, as being a resistance of His will respecting them."

*again...again*] This is not merely repetition, but repetition with a new and additional emphasis. In Bishop Ellicott's language, it

Digitized by Google

whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?

10 Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.

11 I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.

12 Brethren, I beseech you, be as I *am*; for I *am* as ye *are*: ye have not injured me at all.

13 Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.

14 And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor re-

---

was not simply a *relapse* into bondage, but a *recommencement* of its principles. Having given up external formalism in one shape, they were now ready to renew it in another. It startles us to see Heathenism and Judaism thus classed together: but St Paul by no means says that Heathenism is as good as Judaism. Viewed simply as external rudimentary religions, they were alike in character; and in no way could the Apostle have more severely condemned the Judaic system of justification than by this co-ordination.

*weak and beggarly*] These elements were "weak," because they had no spiritual power to raise the devotee to a high level; and they were "beggarly," because they were altogether destitute of that richness of spiritual blessing which resides in the system of the true Gospel.

**10.** *Ye observe*] The word denotes close, slavish, Pharisaic observance.

*days, and months, and times, and years*] See Col. ii. 16. The "days" are the Sabbaths, the "months" the new moons, the "times" are the Jewish festal seasons, and the "years" the sabbatical year and years of Jubilee. The questions of the perpetuity of the Sabbath, which rests on principles laid down before the Mosaic Law, and of Christian seasons, which are within the jurisdiction of the Church, are hardly raised here. What is here in question is legal bondage to an obsolete system. As to the verb, it is not of much moment whether we regard it as interrogative or indicative. In either case it involves an expostulation.

**11.** *in vain*] See above on ii. 2.

**12—16.** HERE THE APOSTLE INTERPOLATES AN APPEAL TO HIS CONVERTS ON THE GROUND OF SYMPATHY.

He suddenly implores them, for the sake of sympathy, that they may be at one with him in these important questions. Once there had been the utmost unity of feeling between them and him. Why should it now be disturbed?

**12.** *Brethren*] This word at once diffuses a tender feeling over the whole paragraph. See vi. 1, and especially vi. 18.

*be as I am*] Literally and correctly, "**become** as I am." Come and stand on my ground; for, he adds, I once left my old ground that I might stand on yours.

*for I am as ye are*] I became what you are now. I gave up far more than I ask you to give up. I gave up all my hereditary religious maxims, all my cherished Hebrew treasures. Cp. 1 Cor. ix. 21, and especially Phil. iii. 4—9.

*ye have not injured me at all*] We must observe that for the moment he is appealing, more on the ground of sympathetic unity than on that of dogmatic truth. He deeply feels their present separation of sentiment. Still he has no personal complaint to make. He carefully guards against so unworthy a misinterpretation of his meaning. When they were together in Galatia, so far from "injuring him in any way," they shewed to him the greatest and most enthusiastic kindness. The remembrance of this kindness and enthusiasm, indeed, forms part of the ground of his present appeal. The tense of all the verbs "injured," "preached," "despised," "received," is the same; and the reference in all seems evidently to be to the same period of time.

**13.** *through infirmity of the flesh*] **on account of an attack of bodily illness.** There is no doubt that this is the accurate translation. It seems that on his first visit to Galatia, he was hindered and detained by this cause; and this led to a full reception of the blessing of the Gospel by the Galatians. He recalls a most touching passage in his experience and theirs. Detained among them by illness, he doubtless won the more upon their affections: and they could not easily forget all the circumstances of that time. The phrase "ye know" appeals to their vivid recollection of the time;—which, it may be observed, corresponds with Acts xvi. 6. And if we combine this circumstance with what we read in Acts xvi. 10, which implies that St Luke was now with St Paul, we are led to conjecture that this illness may have had something to do with this companionship of "the beloved physician" (Col. iv. 14). As to the probable nature of this illness see note on the next verse, where St Paul speaks of it in language of remarkable force.

*at the first*] He had been twice in Galatia (Acts xvi. 6 and xx. 2). There appears to be no doubt that he refers to the earlier of these occasions; and this is an element of some importance in the determination of the date of the Epistle. See the Introduction.

**14.** *my temptation which was in my flesh*] We must first fix, if we can, on the right

Digitized by Google

jected; but received me as an angel of God, *even* as Christ Jesus.

15 [1] Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if *it had been* possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me.

[1] Or, *What was then.*

16 Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?

17 They zealously affect you, *but*

---

reading in this place. There seems no doubt that the correct form is "**your** temptation which was in *my* flesh." As to manuscript authority, this is one of the cases where the Sinaitic MS. turns the balance. Moreover this is at first sight the more difficult reading, while on close examination it turns out to be the most in harmony with the general spirit of the passage.

As regards the nature of this suffering and humiliation of St Paul, which involved "temptation," in a certain sense, to the Galatians themselves, there is no difficulty in identifying it with the "thorn in the flesh," named with so much feeling in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

The precise form of the malady it will never be possible to ascertain (one theory is touched below in the note on *v.* 15), and perhaps it is for the advantage of the Christian Church, that each sufferer will think of his own case, in reading St Paul's language. It is clear that it was some bodily suffering, which hindered his work, and which he deeply felt to be humiliating. It may in some way have disfigured his appearance; and from the language in 2 Cor. xii. 7, where "stake in the flesh" would be more accurate than "thorn in the flesh," it is natural to conclude that it involved great pain. See the note there.

As to that other Epistle, to which reference has just been made, it is important to observe that it was contemporary, and that it is bound together by various subtle links with that which is before us. See the Introduction. In these very passages, thus put closely together, we have a very affecting part of the connection. We seem to see the Apostle through and through when we study them in this way. It is highly probable that he was at this very time suffering from a recurrence of his painful and depressing malady.

A reference may be allowed here to the 'Hulsean Lectures' for 1860 on "The Character of St Paul," 3rd ed. p. 89. There the cases of St Bernard and of Alfred the Great are brought forward in comparison and illustration. Of King Alfred it is said by Asser, his biographer, "He entreated of God's mercy that in His boundless clemency He would exchange these torments for some lighter disease; but with this condition, that it should not show itself outwardly, *lest he should be an object of contempt, and less able to benefit mankind; for he had a great dread of any such complaint as makes men useless or contemptible.*"

*ye despised not, nor rejected*] We see here the fitness of the reading, "*your* temptation." The Galatians might under such circumstances have been tempted to look upon St Paul with some kind of loathing; or at all events he imagined that they might be so tempted; and it is part of his gratitude that they did not yield to any such "temptation."

**15.** *Where is then the blessedness ye spake of?*] It is very doubtful whether we ought to read "*where* then?" or "*what* then?" If the former, the meaning will be "what is become of that felicitation of yourselves, which was so conspicuous when I was with you?" If the latter, then the Apostle says—"What was that demonstrative enthusiasm on my account worth, if it is so soon passed away?" In any case we may justly see in this fickleness an indication of the Galatian character. See the Introduction.

*ye would have plucked out your own eyes*] There is nothing in the original to justify the emphatic "your own" in the Authorised Version. The phrase used by St Paul is simply a proverbial mode of expressing the utmost devotion. Wetstein gives several examples. "Your very eyes" would give the meaning of the phrase correctly.

With this criticism there falls to the ground one of the chief arguments for identifying St Paul's "thorn in the flesh" with some distressing defect in his eyesight. Another argument for this theory drawn from this Epistle (vi. 11) in connection with some supposed peculiarity of his handwriting is a pure assumption, as we shall see below.

**16.** *Am I therefore become your enemy*] He is going to say, "So then I am become your enemy;" but he turns the sentence into the gentler form of a question.

*because I tell you the truth*] It is best to adhere to the participial form of the original, **in speaking the truth to you**. Otherwise the words might seem to refer to the effect of the present letter, which St Paul could not possibly know. It is probable that he refers to what he had observed on his second visit, when giving them warnings similar to the present.

**17—20.** THEIR BETRAYERS HAD NO REAL LOVE FOR THEM, SUCH AS HE HAD.

He exposes the hollow and insincere motives of those who are paying court to them, and gives expression once more to his own intense yearning over them.

**17.** *They zealously affect you, but not well*]

Digitized by Google

not well; yea, they would exclude [1] you, that ye might affect them.

[1] Or, *us*.

18 But *it is* good to be zealously affected always in *a* good *thing*, and not only when I am present with you.

19 My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you,

20 I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for [1] I stand in doubt of you.

[1] Or, *I am perplexed for you*.

21 Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?

22 For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.

23 But he *who was* of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman *was* by promise.

---

They manifest the utmost interest in you, the utmost regard for you; but their motive is a bad one; they make themselves your partizans, that you may attach yourselves to their party. This is the force of what concludes the verse —"that ye might affect them."

*they would exclude you*] Their wish is to isolate you from the general body of sound Christian believers, that they may glory in having you identified with their clique.

**18.** *it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing*] All this manifestation of warm feeling is good. It is by no means to be blamed or despised. It is good too to be the object of such feeling, if only the cause is good, and if only there is consistency. This seems to carry us on correctly along the Apostle's line of thought to what he says at the end of the verse, "not only when I am present with you." Once he had been the object of such manifestation of warm feeling, when he was among them. Now all is changed. Others are become the object of this feeling, and the cause is no longer a good one. As to the grammar, it is to be observed that ζηλοῦσθαι is passive, and denotes "to be zealously courted."

**19.** *My little children*] It seems for a moment as if St John were speaking. See his first Epistle. The language is quite unique in St Paul; but it precisely fits the metaphor in the sentence, and it presents to them an argument of immense force. He was, spiritually, in a parental relation to them, which could be shared by no one else. Cp. 1 Cor. iv. 15, "Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel."

*of whom I travail in birth again*] The parental relation is expressed under the tenderest form. He writes not as their father, but as their mother. The same imagery is found in 1 Thess. ii. 7, "Even as a nurse cherisheth *her own* children."

*until Christ be formed in you*] Until ye come to the full maturity of Christian birth.

**20.** *I desire to be present with you*] I wish we were once more face to face. This is to be carefully set side by side with what we find at the end of *v.* 18.

*to change my voice*] He longs to find it unnecessary to speak with this severity; and he is sanguine enough to hope that it would not be necessary if he could be with them once more.

*for I stand in doubt of you*] This is full of feeling. He is absent from them; and he is perplexed as to what he ought to think of them and what he ought to say to them.

**21—31.** THE HISTORY OF ABRAHAM IS LIKEWISE AN ALLEGORY STRICTLY APPLICABLE TO THE CASE IN HAND.

The Apostle's thought reverts to Abraham, but in a new form. He sees in the incidents of the Patriarch's tent anticipations of Gospel principles, and a rehearsal of the unkindness to which they who thoroughly accept the Gospel are exposed.

**21.** *ye that desire to be under the law*] Ye that are so eager to take Law for the principle of your religious life. There is no article in the original.

*do ye not hear the law?*] Will ye not listen to what the Law itself says? Here the original has the article. The Hebrew law is, of course, in such an argument, the great embodiment of the principle of Law. Moreover it had a Divine sanction which belongs to none other. It is immaterial whether in this clause we restrict the word "law" to the Pentateuch, or regard it as synonymous with the Old Testament generally.

**22.** *it is written*] He takes the Judaizers on their own ground, and boldly refers to the Hebrew Scriptures allegorically interpreted.

*a bondmaid...a freewoman*] Strictly, "**the** bondmaid—**the** freewoman"—the well-known bondmaid (Hagar)—the well-known freewoman (Sarah). In the next verse the translation in the Authorised Version is exact.

**23.** *after the flesh*] According to the usual course of nature.

*by promise*] Through the instrumentality of the Promise, which was given when birth

Digitized by Google

24 Which things are an allegory: for these are the two [1] covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.

[1] Or, *testaments.*

25 For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and [1] answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

[1] Or, *is in the same rank with.*

26 But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

27 For it is written, [a] Rejoice, *thou* barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.

[a] Isai. 54. 1.

28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

---

according to the course of nature was impossible. The emphasis involved in this word "promise" is powerfully unfolded in Rom. iv. 17—22. See also Rom. ix. 7—9. Isaac and Ishmael had one father; but they were children of Abraham in two very different senses.

**24.** *Which things are an allegory*] It does not seem that the Authorised Version here could be improved. "Which things" denotes the whole range of the subject (see Col. ii. 23). St Paul, of course, accepts the Patriarchal narrative as literally and historically true. But he says that it is capable also of an allegorical interpretation. A mystical meaning lies hid under this literal history; and the spiritually-instructed mind can see in it an expression of principles deeper than that which lies on the surface. What Calvin says very well here is, in substance, as follows: "Just as the house of Abraham was then the true Church, so there is no doubt that the principal and most memorable events that happened therein were types for us; just as there was allegory in circumcision, in the sacrifices, in the whole Levitical priesthood, so likewise was there allegory in the house of Abraham."

*these are the two covenants*] When the subject is treated allegorically, these two women, Agar and Sara, represent the two covenants, the former being the mother of slaves, the latter the mother of freemen. Bishop Lightfoot illustrates the form of language by referring to Matt. xiii. 39, xxvi. 26—28; 1 Cor. x. 4.

*the one from the mount Sinai*] It was there that the Mosaic covenant was given.

*which gendereth to bondage*] The children of this covenant, like the children of Agar, can be only slaves.

*which is Agar*] For this is the covenant which corresponds with Agar—which in the allegory is represented by Agar.

**25.** *For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia*] This is one of the cases in which modern criticism has removed a great amount of the difficulty felt by commentators. The discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript has settled a point which was previously doubtful, and it appears that the true reading is simply this, "for Mount Sinai is in Arabia"—in the very region which was the home of Agar and Ishmael. The very geographical circumstances of the case enhance the significance of the allegory. Thus we are not at all entangled with the very questionable opinion that Agar was a recognised name of Mount Sinai. Such a verbal connection would have complicated, and by no means simplified, the analogy. For further illustration of the passage see the longer note at the end of this chapter. Reference may also be permitted to a Cambridge sermon by the present writer, entitled 'Hagar and Arabia.' (1864.)

*and answereth to Jerusalem which now is*] *i.e.* the covenant of Mount Sinai, represented by Agar, corresponds with the earthly temporary Jerusalem. The first clause of *v.* 25 is parenthetic, and the full stop ought to be removed from the end of *v.* 24.

**26.** *Jerusalem which is above is free*] The heavenly Jerusalem finds its counterpart in the condition of Sara, just as the earthly Jerusalem finds its counterpart in that of Agar. The phrase "Jerusalem which is above" can be illustrated copiously from other parts of the New Testament. See Phil. iii. 20; Heb. xii. 2; Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2.

*which is the mother of us all*] The true reading is simply "which is **our mother**," the words "of us all" having probably come, through the carelessness of copyists, from Rom. iv. 16.

**27.** *For it is written*] The quotation is from Isai. liv. 1. In order to see the force of this quotation, the whole range of the contiguous prophecies of Isaiah should be carefully examined, and especially li. 2, where is a distinct reference to Abraham and Sara.

*many more children than*] Literally, **many children, many more than.** Each woman has many children, but the barren woman has more than the other.

*she which hath an husband*] She to whom for the time the husband of the two women was given. Sarah was barren when Agar after the order of nature became the mother of Ishmael.

**28.** *Now we, brethren*] The true reading

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER V.

*1 He moveth them to stand in their liberty, 3 and not to observe circumcision: 13 but rather love, which is the sum of the law. 19 He reckoneth up the works of the flesh, 22 and the fruits of the Spirit, 25 and exhorteth to walk in the Spirit.*

STAND fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

2 Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shal profit you nothing.

3 For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.

4 Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.

5 For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

6 For in Jesus Christ neither cir-

---

CHAP. V. 1. There is no doubt that this verse should be joined with the preceding context. It is not the beginning of the concluding section, but the end of the middle section, of the Epistle. As to the precise reading, however, of the verse there is great doubt. The state of the MSS. is very curious and perplexing. See Bishop Lightfoot's full and careful note on the subject. Adopting his conclusion, we shall read the whole passage thus: "Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free-woman, in the freedom wherein Christ set us free. Stand firm therefore, and suffer not yourselves to be again involved in a yoke of bondage."

*Stand fast*] See Eph. vi. 14; 2 Thess. ii. 15.

*again*] The Jewish yoke of bondage was not identical with their old Heathen yoke; still they were recurring to the same false principle.

**2—6.** TO ADOPT JUDAISM IS ALIENATION FROM CHRIST.

St Paul solemnly warns the Galatians that the adoption of the legal principle of justification involves complete alienation from Christ.

**2.** *Behold, I Paul*] This is made doubly emphatic, first by the exclamation which calls attention to what he is about to say, and secondly by the use of his own personal name, which asserts his Apostolical authority, reminds them of what they owed to him, and thus appeals alike to their affection and to their loyalty.

*if ye be circumcised*] If you submit to this rite under the circumstances in which you are now placed. That circumcision in itself was "nothing" St Paul himself says, *v.* 6. Moreover he himself had caused Timothy to be circumcised (Acts xvi. 3); and on this ground perhaps the Apostle was accused of inconsistency. All depended on the circumstances of the time. He had refused to allow Titus to be circumcised at Antioch (ii. 3—5); and the ground which he took then he maintains in writing to the Galatians now.

*Christ shall profit you nothing*] See ii. 21.

**3.** *I testify again*] **I protest** would be a more accurate translation. As to the word "again," he is here virtually repeating what he had said before in this Epistle; and probably he had said the same thing when he was among the Galatians.

*every man*] The rule is peremptory and absolute, admitting of no possible exceptions. See "whosoever" in the next verse.

*that is circumcised*] Strictly, **who causes himself to be circumcised**, or, **who allows himself to be circumcised.**

*a debtor to do the whole law*] He here gives the reason for what he had said in the preceding verse. He who adopts the legal method of justification, binds himself to the necessity of perfect obedience in order to procure salvation. "Law" here must mean the moral law. No enlightened man could suppose that obedience to a mere ceremonial law, even if perfect, could suffice.

**4.** *is become of no effect*] In adopting this course **ye separated yourselves from Christ**: all your relation to Christ was absolutely neutralised. The verb καταργεῖν is frequently used by St Paul, and there is no doubt as to its meaning.

*whosoever of you*] See note on the preceding verse.

*are fallen*] **ye fell**, *ipso facto*, in the very act of adopting the legal principle.

**5.** *we*] We, who have adopted the opposite principle. The position of the word makes it emphatic.

*through the Spirit...by faith*] The Holy Spirit is meant. There is here a double antithesis to describe the attitude of the Judaizers. "Spirit" is opposed to "flesh," and "by faith" to "in law."

*the hope of righteousness*] *i.e.* the fulfilment of the hope which justification involves. It is not merely a past blessing, but a blessing which reaches into the far future. The full fruition of it is yet to come. Hence this subject falls within the province of hope. See Acts xxiv. 15; Titus ii. 13.

**6.** *in Jesus Christ*] Wherever a true living union with Jesus Christ subsists by faith.

*neither circumcision......nor uncircumcision*] We should not fail to note the perfect fair-

Digitized by Google

cumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

7 Ye did run well; [1]who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?

[1] Or, who did drive you back?

8 This persuasion *cometh* not of him that calleth you.

9 A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

10 I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.

11 And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased.

---

ness of this. Freedom from Judaic observances is in itself no better than the keeping of them. Those who simply boast of their independence of all Judaic conditions meet here with a deserved rebuke. This form of language may have been very customary with St Paul: for we find it three times, though in each case the sentence has a different conclusion; and it is very instructive to observe the differences of the conclusions. See 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. vi. 15. It is to be observed, however, that these two Epistles were nearly contemporary. See note in the Introduction.

*availeth*] (ἰσχύει). No real spiritual power resides either in the observance of Jewish ceremonies, or in abstinence therefrom.

*faith which worketh by love*] We touch a great controversy here. The translation in the Authorised Version is accepted, however, without hesitation. The verb (ἐνεργουμένη) is not passive, but middle, as in 2 Cor. i. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 13. Thus no countenance is given here to the Roman Catholic doctrine of *Fides caritate formata*, which is inconsistent with the prerogative of Faith as the justifying principle. Love, however, must be the method and medium of the working of Faith.

**7—12. With mingled indignation and tenderness he passes on to the practical part of the Epistle.**

In this paragraph is a stern and abrupt condemnation of those who had caused this perversion, mingled with warning and encouragement to those who had been perverted.

**7.** *Ye did run well*] A metaphor from the foot-race in the Greek games, as in ii. 2.

*who did hinder you*] The word "hinder" (ἐνέκοψεν), here metaphorically used, denotes the breaking up of a road. Some commentators urge that ἀνέκοψεν, which is found in some MSS., and which denotes the thrusting back of one who is in motion, would suit the image better. But is this quite certain? The breaking up of the whole footway, so as entirely to hinder free course in the right direction, seems to fit the case exactly.

**8.** *This persuasion*] The persuasion to which you are yielding.

*him that calleth you*] According to the analogy of St Paul's style, this denotes God. See the note on iii. 5.

**9.** *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*] One of those proverbs of the New Testament which may be termed condensed parables. We find it also in the (nearly contemporary) First Epistle to the Corinthians (v. 6); and in each case the reference seems to be, not so much to the spreading effect of incipient sin, as to gradual and growing mischief done to a whole community by a corrupt minority.

**10.** *confidence in you*] Literally, **in reference to you**. This is an instance of St Paul's conciliatory manner in the midst of severity. He always "hopes better things," though he "thus speaks."

*through the Lord*] Literally, "**in** the Lord." This gives the ground of his confidence.

*none otherwise minded*] He hopes that they will adopt views in accordance with what he here says, or in accordance with what he had previously taught them. There is no real difference between these two standards of truth.

*he that troubleth you*] In i. 7 it is "*some* that trouble you." Perhaps there is here an understood reference to some definite ringleader, whom he does not name. The same Greek word (ταράσσω) is used in the two cases, and contains a political metaphor, like ἀναστατοῦντες below in *v.* 12.

*whosoever he be*] Whatever be his dignity, or learning, or supposed religious advantages. See ii. 6.

**11.** *And I, brethren*] He speaks with great severity: but not against the Galatians themselves; this is shewn by the tender word "brethren." He refers to some who had falsely accused him. It had been said that he himself really preached the Judaic and legal doctrine. This imputation he indignantly repels.

*if I yet preach circumcision*] The ground of the accusation may have been the fact of his circumcising Timothy. The word "yet" denotes "up to the present moment." Or it may refer to the time before his conversion, when, of course, his whole life was a preaching of circumcisions.

*why do I yet suffer persecution?*] Why does my persecution by the Jews continue up to this moment? For the fact of this unceasing persecution by Jews during the Third Missionary Journey, see, for instance, Acts xx. 3.

*then is the offence of the cross ceased*] See



Digitized by Google

12 I would they were even cut off which trouble you.

13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only *use* not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.

14 For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in this; [c]Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

[c] Lev. 19. 18. Matt. 22. 39.

15 But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.

16 *This* I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and [1]ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.

[1] Or, *fulfil not.*

---

note above (*v.* 4) on the meaning of "cease" (καταργέω). There would be nothing then to give offence to the Judaizers. The great stumbling-block would be removed. Take away the Cross: omit the atoning death of Christ: and all difficulty is gone.

**12.** *I would they were even cut off*] It would be well if they were to resort to a worse and more thorough mutilation. It seems that this must be the meaning of the passage, though it naturally gives a shock to our modern feelings. Bishop Lightfoot justly points out that the difficulty is much diminished by the fact that such repulsive practices were well known in Galatia in connection with the worship of Cybele. Such subjects must in that day have been a frequent subject of conversation. We must remember too that the false teachers were putting a mere injury of the body in the place of spiritual Christianity, and that this is utterly repulsive to the spiritual mind. St Paul is expressing here his abhorrence of a religion of this kind. The same thought is found, though the language is not so vehement, in Phil. iii. 2, 3.

*which trouble you*] The word "trouble" is too weak. **Subvert** or **pervert** would be better. The force of the political metaphor is well expressed by Chrysostom, who says that the Judaizers were driving the Galatians from the freedom of the Heavenly Jerusalem, and sending them forth as outcasts to seek a new home.

### 13—15. Exhortation to unity of spirit.

He passes here to direct practical instruction. Having strenuously urged the necessity of resisting those who were leading them into legal bondage, he now warns them of the danger of *false* freedom, as regards moral duties.

**13.** *called unto liberty*] "**for** liberty." This is the very principle of the Christian calling, the very ground of the Christian standing. In 1 Thess. iv. 7 we have a good illustration of St Paul's use both of ἐπὶ and of καλεῖν.

*the flesh*] In nothing does the carnal spirit shew itself more clearly than in contention. See 1 Cor. iii. 3.

*serve*] A very strong word. He could use no stronger. "Be in bondage. Be slaves." And it is purposely contrasted with "liberty." A similar turn of language is found in 1 Pet. ii. 16. There however the opposition is not between freedom and mutual service, one among another: but the "service of God" is presented to us as the "perfect freedom."

**14.** *all the law is fulfilled in one word*] The whole law is thoroughly obeyed in the observance of this one precept. We have an exact parallel in Rom. xiii. 8.

*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*] There is a reference, doubtless, both to Lev. xix. 18, and to our Lord's emphatic reiteration of the ancient golden precept. Prof. Sanday remarks here that in the original command "neighbour" appears to mean "thy fellow-Israelite," but that our Lord, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, "had given it a wider signification, and in the same wider sense it is used here."

**15.** *if ye bite and devour one another*] We should note the threefold repetition of "one another." See note on vi. 2. Chrysostom has a good comment here. "He says not simply *bite*, which indicates sudden anger, but *devour*, which implies continuance in an evil mind."

*that ye be not consumed one of another*] Mutual anger and mutual hate must result in mutual destruction. No more solemn warning could be given against party-spirit. In this way "spiritual life is altogether annihilated," to use Dean Alford's expression. Probably we ought to bear in mind here the naturally quarrelsome and contentious temperament of the Galatians. An ancient writer describes them as "avidi jurgiorum." See the Introduction.

### 16—26. The works of the Flesh and the fruit of the Spirit.

**16.** *This I say then*] He has negatively warned them not to abuse their Christian liberty. Now he gives the positive law of the Christian life.

*Walk in the Spirit*] It is in and through the Holy Spirit that guidance is given for the Christian life. The word "walk," which is of such frequent use in the Scriptures for this subject, denotes activity, alacrity, perseverance, progress, and, above all, direction. The same metaphor is resumed below in the use of a different verb, v. 25, vi. 16.

*ye shall not fulfil*] Commentators have

Digitized by Google

17 For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

18 But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.

19 Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these;* Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,

20 Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

21 Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told *you* in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

22 But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,

---

debated whether this is a promise or a command. It seems quite justifiable to say that it is both.

**17.** *the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh*] The "desire" of each is hostile to the other. The verbal link with the preceding verse is lost in the A. V. The essential commentary on these words is the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. In the second clause of the sentence a different verb instead of ἐπιθυμεῖ must be supplied.

*so that ye cannot do the things that ye would*] It is better to adhere to the exact translation **in order that ye may not do.** The meaning is given well by Winer, "quo minus perficiatis." It is not the final victory of the Christian which is here described, but the conflict that precedes it. Whichever way the struggle inclines, the will is hindered, because, in fact, there are two wills. The flesh is here personified, as it were, in its warfare with the Spirit.

**18.** *if ye be led of the Spirit*] If ye **are** led. In this case the victory has been practically obtained on the right side. Compare Rom. viii. 14, "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

*not under the law*] In proportion as the Spirit rules, the law finds nothing to condemn, it is disarmed. We should observe how, in describing this conflict, the Apostle passes from the use of the word "flesh" to the use of the word "law." In this argument the two terms seem almost interchangeable. At all events they have, in his view, an essential affinity with one another. See note on iii. 3.

**19.** *the works of the flesh...which are these*] Rather, **such as these.** The catalogue is not exhaustive. On the contrast between "works" and "fruit" see below. The enumeration of the "works of the flesh," without being very precise, falls into four general sections, sensuality, idolatry, contention, and excess. Bengel expresses the same thing by saying that the sins are enumerated as "commissa cum proximo, adversus Deum, adversus proximum, et circa seipsum;" and he traces a correlative subdivision in the classification of "the fruit of the Spirit." The placing of that which is specially "deadly sin" first in the position of prominence is quite in harmony with what we find elsewhere in the inspired writings.

*uncleanness, lasciviousness*] The difference in this passage between the two Greek words appears to be this, that the latter adds the idea of utter shamelessness to that which is implied in the former.

**20.** *witchcraft*] That sorcery was prevalent at Ephesus weknow from Acts xix. 19. Bishop Lightfoot mentions the condemnation of such practices by a Councilheld in Galatia in the early part of the fourth century.

*strife*] (ἐριθεῖαι). The derivation and meaning of this word, here and in six other places of the Apostolic Epistles, were long misunderstood, and were supposed to be identical with the derivation and meaning of ἔρις. The word is really formed from ἔριθος, "a day labourer," and means party-spirit, with the notion added of low intrigue. See the note on Rom. ii. 8.

**21.** *I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past*] He warns them now of the judgment impending over those who are guilty of such sins, and reminds them that his teaching on this subject had been the same, when he was with them.

**22.** *the fruit of the Spirit*] The use of the word "fruit" is very common in the writings of St Paul, and exemplifies, so to speak, his exuberant expansive habit of mind. See the 'Horæ Paulinæ,' as edited by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, App. viii. p. 451. Another point is to be carefully observed here, viz. the sharp contrast between "works" and "fruit." On this Chrysostom remarks that what is bad comes readily from ourselves alone, and therefore is rightly described by the former term, whereas the good that we do depends not on ourselves only,



Digitized by Google

23 Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.

24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the [1]affections and lusts.

[1] Or, *passions.*

25 If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.

26 Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.

---

but needs God's fostering care. It may be added that "fruit" is always used by St Paul in a good sense. See *e.g.* Tit. iii. 14.

**22, 23.** We cannot very precisely classify the enumeration of the Christian graces in these two verses: but, on the whole, they fall most naturally into three groups of three each. We should carefully observe that "love" has the first place in the list.

**22.** *gentleness*] Archbishop Trench says that the Greek word denotes "a long holding out of the mind before it gives room to action or passion." A man has this grace, "who, having to do with injurious persons, does not suffer himself easily to be provoked by them." 'N. T. Synonym.' pp. 187, 189.

*faith*] The word πίστις, as used here, seems to denote "fidelity" or "trustworthiness," and to correspond, on the whole, to what we term "honesty of character." Or perhaps we should prefer the explanation of Wieseler, who understands the word to mean "readiness to believe." One part of St Paul's description of charity (1 Cor. xiii. 7) is that it "believeth all things."

**23.** *Meekness, temperance*] The former denotes the retaining of our equanimity and composure under provocations, because we are conscious of our own sin and assured of God's justice, the latter denotes in general the restraining of our natural evil propensities.

*against such there is no law*] This must be very closely coupled with what is said in the 18th verse.

**24.** *have crucified the flesh*] This was done once for all, when they became Christians. It is implied in our baptism. To live in any other way is a contradiction to our Christian profession. How far we have been consistent in our lives since our baptism is a question not raised here. See Rom. vi. 2—6. The strength of the expression "crucified" should be noted, first because it is in harmony with the frequent mention of the crucifixion of Christ in this Epistle, and secondly, because it expresses separation from sin in the most decisive way, by death, and by a painful death. See vi. 14.

**25.** *in the Spirit*] Or rather, "**by** the Spirit." In the second clause of the sentence it seems almost certain that this must be the meaning. In the first clause possibly "**to** the Spirit" would be the correct translation. See v. 16 and vi. 16.

*let us also walk*] He resumes what he had said above, but with a different and more precise verb (στοιχῶμεν).

**26.** *desirous of vain glory*] We can probably say with truth this was a Gaulish fault.

*provoking one another, envying one another*] To the former fault the strong would be liable, to the latter the weak. By "provoking" is meant the challenging to combat in disputation.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on CHAP. V.

### CONNECTION OF V. 1 WITH THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING CHAPTER.

The reasons for preferring the arrangement adopted for the connection between these two chapters are briefly these. Some good MSS. omit "wherewith" (ᾗ) after "in the liberty" (τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ). If we were to adopt this reading, we should then be obliged to begin ch. v. with such a sentence as this: "Christ liberated us in liberty" (or "for liberty"). This, however, would be very abrupt; and, on the whole, the authority for the retention of "wherewith" preponderates. Hence we must connect these words either with the preceding or the following: and the decision of this question depends on the position of "therefore" (οὖν) in the context. The Authorised Version gives a sense which, as to its moral and religious force, cannot be improved. It proceeds, however, on the assumption that οὖν comes immediately after τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, whereas the preponderance of manuscript authority places it after στήκετε. A Greek scholar will at once perceive the force of the argument, if the words are simply written down in order:—τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ᾗ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε στήκετε οὖν.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *He moveth them to deal mildly with a brother that hath slipped,* 2 *and to bear one another's burden:* 6 *to be liberal to their teachers,* 9 *and not weary of well doing.* 12 *He sheweth what they intend that preach circumcision.* 14 *He glorieth in nothing, save in the cross of Christ.*

BRETHREN, [1] if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.

[1] Or, *although.*

2 Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.

3 For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.

4 But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another.

5 For every man shall bear his own burden.

6 Let him that is taught in the

---

CHAP. VI. 1—5. OUR OWN WEAKNESS AND RESPONSIBILITY OUGHT TO MAKE US CONSIDERATE OF OTHERS.

Continued exhortation to the exercise of sympathy and forbearance on the one hand, and to the cherishing of a sense of responsibility on the other.

1. *Brethren*] This tender form of expression, recurring several times in this Epistle, softens the general severity of its tone. See especially the last verse of this chapter. In the Greek original the same word is at the end and at the beginning of the chapter.

*if a man be overtaken in a fault*] The language in the original is very strong, and literally means, "if he be even caught, so that there is no possibility of escape or excuse." A case of flagrant, unquestionable ill-doing is supposed. This very much enhances the force of the precept which follows.

*ye which are spiritual*] This is an appeal to those among the Galatians who really had a true appreciation of the religion of the Gospel, that they should be tenderly considerate of others. Among such persons there might be a temptation to censoriousness and spiritual pride: and possibly a slight admonition and rebuke to this effect is intended.

*restore such an one*] Properly this is a surgical term: and if we dwell on this thought, the rich meaning of the passage opens out upon us more fully. In Matt. iv. 21 the word is employed of the mending of nets. Compare its use in 1 Thess. iii. 10 and 1 Pet. v. 10.

*the spirit of meekness*] The action of the Holy Spirit is implied. We find analogous expressions in Rom. i. 4 and Eph. i. 17.

*considering thyself*] This sudden change of number makes the advice all the more pointed. We should also carefully note the emphatic "thou" (σύ). We are all liable to unexpected temptations. Hence "the spirit of meekness" becomes us in trying to "restore" others. Nor is any other spirit likely to be successful.

2. *one another's burdens*] The phrase "one another" is put in the forefront of the sentence. See above on v. 13, 14. This Epistle teaches very forcibly the lesson of *mutual* regard, sympathy, and help; and perhaps the Galatians were much in need of this lesson. See note on v. 15. For the word "burden" see below on *v.* 5.

*so fulfil*] Or "so ye shall fulfil," as in v. 16. It is not very material which reading we adopt; and each is well supported.

*the law of Christ*] This use of the word "law" comes upon us very unexpectedly, and with great beauty and force. Compare 1 Cor. ix. 21, where it is said that the Christian, though he does not seek to be justified through the law, is still "under law to Christ." The law of Christ is His "new commandment that we love one another:" and it is precisely in such mutual consideration and regard that this law is fulfilled.

3. *he deceiveth himself*] The Greek verb (φρεναπατᾷ) denotes an inward state of self-deception. Hence the contrast with ἔργον in the next verse. It is this liability to "think ourselves to be somewhat" (ii. 6) which causes us to break the law of love. The noun φρεναπάτης is found in Tit. i. 10. Compare James i. 26.

4. *work*] as opposed to feelings and fancies.

*then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone*] **with reference to** himself alone, not (by comparison) with reference to others. He shall have his own ground for self-congratulation, whether it be little or much. The language is very similar to that which we find in 1 Cor. iv. 5.

5. *every man shall bear his own burden*] It is very instructive to compare this with what precedes, "Bear ye one another's burdens," especially when the two sentences are in such close juxtaposition. The meaning of the whole is: "Bear ye one another's burden of trial and suffering: for every man must bear his own burden of duty and responsibility." The words used for "burden" in the two cases are different. Augustine puts the point of contrast well: "The burden of sharing human infirmity is one thing, the

Digitized by Google

word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.

7 Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

8 For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.

9 And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.

10 As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all *men*,

---

burden of giving an account of our actions to God is quite another thing: the former is distributed among our brethren to be mutually borne, the latter rests on each one separately and apart."

**6—10. THE DUTY AND THE REWARD OF BENEFICENCE.**

**6.** *Let him that is taught*] The verb used in this phrase and in the phrase "him that teacheth" below is familiar to us elsewhere, as primarily denoting *oral* instruction. It is the word from which our term "catechism" is derived. The passage shews us clearly that careful religious teaching was already part of the system of the Christian Church.

*communicate...in all good things*] The duty of the sustentation of Christian ministers, in all respects, is everywhere urged strongly by St Paul. Compare especially 1 Tim. v. 17, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine," where the word "honour" (τιμὴ) may well be regarded as including not only money, but sympathy, respect, promotion of comfort, alleviation of care.

**7.** *Be not deceived*] In two other places (1 Cor. vi. 9 and xv. 33) St Paul uses this form of warning, and in both cases with reference to immoral life. Hence there is peculiar solemnity in the expression. Why this tone should be adopted here, we do not know. Probably there was some glaring neglect of duty among the Galatians, either as to the support of their ministers, or in regard to that general liberality to which he now proceeds. It may be, however, that this tone of solemnity is due to what is about to follow. In *v.* 8 he touches other parts of the conduct of life, besides that which pertains to generous giving.

*God is not mocked*] There may be an attempt to treat God with contempt by false appearances: but this attempt cannot be successful. We may refer in illustration to the case of Ananias and Sapphira.

*whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap*] That, and nothing else. We have other instances of the same form of language in this Epistle. See, for instance, iii. 7. Chrysostom says, "That which is sown and that which is reaped must be of the same kind." St Paul's proverbial language in this verse is found also in 2 Cor. ix. 6, where the reference is to the collection in progress for the poor Christians in Judæa. We should remember that the Galatian Church had been asked to contribute, as well as the Macedonian and Achaian.

**8.** *to his flesh...to the Spirit*] At first sight the metaphor seems to be now slightly changed. Above the reference was to the quality and identity of the seed: here it appears rather to be to the nature of the soil in which the seed is sown. Probably however "unto" denotes simply direction or tendency. If carnal indulgence is the end for which a man lives, moral ruin must be the result. If he aims at the higher life which comes through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the higher life will be his sure reward. In any case we ought carefully to mark the "his own" (ἑαυτοῦ) which is connected with "flesh" (σάρκα). Aquinas, quoted by the Roman Catholic commentator, Windischmann, points out the significance of this addition: "When he speaks of sowing to the flesh, he says *his own* flesh, because the flesh is of our very nature; but when he speaks of sowing to the Spirit, he says not *his own*, because the Spirit is not ours from ourselves, but from God."

*corruption*] The metaphor may be pushed even into the use of this word, in the sense of blighted decaying ears of grain, in contrast to healthy fruitful ears. But it seems best to give simply an ethical sense to the word (φθοράν). So it is employed in 1 Cor. xv. 42; Col. ii. 22.

**9.** *let us not be weary in well doing*] We find the same precept in nearly identical words in 2 Thess. iii. 13. The verb (ἐκκακῶμεν) is to be closely connected with "if we faint not" (ἐκλυόμενοι) below, and denotes the giving up of all vigorous effort because of faint-heartedness.

*in due season*] In its proper appointed time, as in 1 Tim. ii. 6, vi. 15. The Apostle still proceeds with the analogy of the harvest. We must wait, as the husbandman waits: but the time of reaping will come. See James v. 7.

*if we faint not*] The same Greek word is used in Mark viii. 3.

**10.** *As we have therefore opportunity*] Our business is to do all the good we can to all, using every opportunity. The sowing

Digitized by Google

especially unto them who are of the household of faith.

11 Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand.

12 As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.

13 For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.

---

has its καίρος, as well as the reaping; and this καίρος may come at any moment of our lives.

*them who are of the household of faith*] It has been pointed out by commentators that οἰκεῖος is often used of close acquaintance and connection, without any thought of a metaphor, by classical writers, and even in the LXX. (Isai. lviii. 7). But the image of a household is so customary a Scriptural representation of the Church, that it is well to adhere to it in this place. Compare Eph. ii. 19.

**11—14.** ONCE MORE THE JUDAIZERS ARE STERNLY CONDEMNED.

In approaching his conclusion, the Apostle turns again with severity upon those who were the enemies of truth, and the causes of mischief in the Churches of Galatia.

**11.** *Ye see*] This is more probably imperative. He suddenly calls attention to the very aspect of the letter, as exhibiting proofs of his vehement earnestness of spirit, as well as of his authoritative teaching and commands.

*how large a letter*] We may say with confidence that this rendering in the Authorised Version is wrong. The letter is not a long one. But moreover, if this were the meaning, we should have γράμματα not γράμμασιν. The reference is to the large size of the characters in which he is writing. Several commentators have supposed also that these characters were ugly and mis-shapen; and some have connected this thought with a supposed weakness in St Paul's eyesight. See note (iv. 14) on "his temptation in the flesh" The argument has been nowhere drawn out so well as in Dr Brown's 'Horæ Subsecivæ': and an essay on this subject by an accomplished physician is necessarily interesting. The argument, however, cannot be accepted as conclusive. The word "how great" (πηλίκος) denotes, not shape, but size. Probably St Paul's customary handwriting was large: but moreover in the present instance the forcible characters in which he wrote were to be taken as an emphatic expression of his feeling.

*I have written unto you with mine own hand*] We should say, "I am writing." "I wrote" (ἔγραψα) is the epistolary aorist, in the use of which the writer places himself in the position of the reader. An interesting question arises here, as to whether this autographic writing extended to the whole Epistle, or comprised merely this conclusion. We cannot answer this question with absolute confidence. It has been urged that this strong expression would hardly be adapted to the mere conclusion of a letter: but it is to be observed that this part of the present Epistle is much longer than the autograph conclusion which we find elsewhere, as in Col. iv. 18. That St Paul was in the habit of dictating his letters is undoubted. See Rom. xvi. 22.

**12.** *to make a fair shew in the flesh*] To wear a specious appearance in mere outward things. See Matt. xxiii. 27.

*they constrain you to be circumcised*] These are the men—this is the true character of the men—who do their best to force you to adopt circumcision.

*only*] This is their only motive. We find a similar displacement of the word (μόνον) in ii. 10 and in 2 Thess. ii. 7.

*lest they should suffer persecution*] In this way they managed to avoid every approach to martyrdom. Their motive was utterly selfish. See v. 11.

**13.** *neither they themselves...keep the law*] Both here and in Rom. ii. 25 "law" (νόμος) is without the article: and probably St Paul in both passages has regard to the broad general truth that the moral law cannot be kept by any man, and that therefore any attempt to seek for salvation through legal justification must be a mistake. It is probable, however, also that these Judaizers in Galatia were palpably inconsistent even as respected the outward observance of the Jewish law.

*they...who are circumcised*] The circumcision party. Some manuscripts and editors have περιτετμημένοι instead of περιτεμνόμενοι. But both external evidence and the general sense of the passage are strongly in favour of the latter reading.

*that they may glory in your flesh*] Your bodily mutilation is to be made subservient to their credit. The word "your," like the word "you," is emphatic. This clause exhibits the selfishness of the Judaizers in another aspect. "In this way," says Alford, "they escaped the scandal of the Cross at the hands of the Jews, by making in fact their Christian converts into Jewish proselytes."

Digitized by Google

14 But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, [1]by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.

[1] Or, *whereby*.

15 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

16 And as many as walk according to this rule, peace *be* on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.

17 From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.

18 Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with your spirit. Amen.

¶ Unto the Galatians written from Rome.

---

### 14—16. The glory, power and blessing of the Cross.

Having finished his condemnation of the Judaizers, St Paul now asserts, positively, the true principles of the Gospel, and extends his benediction to all who maintain those principles.

**14.** *glory*] Having mentioned the "boast," which was the selfish aim of the Judaizers, he passes along the line of this word to the noble "boast" of the Christian. The best commentary on this passage is Phil. v. 1—12.

*the cross*] The boast is not simply in Jesus Christ, but in Jesus Christ *crucified.* See note on iii. 1, and compare 1 Cor. i. 13, 23, ii. 2, 8.

*the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world*] So that the one is absolutely separated from the other. "Alter pro altero habet mortuum." But not only is the image of *death* applied to describe this separation: the reference to the *crucifixion* of Christ supplies a still stronger image to intensify the meaning.

**15.** *a new creature*] Compare 2 Cor. v. 17 and Eph. iv. 24. The earlier part of this sentence is verbally a repetition of what we find in v. 6; and in substance it is a repetition of 1 Cor. vii. 19. It is most interesting and instructive to put together the three phrases which are used in these three passages to point the contrast between Christianity and formalism.

**16.** *as many*] We should mark the large all-embracing confidence of this phrase. No narrow ecclesiasticism dwarfs St Paul's benediction. It is like the close of the Epistle to the Ephesians: "Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,"—with which we should compare and contrast the close of the First Epistle to the Corinthians: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema."

*as walk according to this rule*] **shall walk** is the true reading, which carries the comprehensiveness of the benediction over all the future history of the Church. The Apostle reverts here to the language used in v. 25. The word κανὼν, literally a measuring line, is used here to denote a line of direction. See 2 Cor. x. 13.

*mercy*] There is a touch of tenderness in the introduction of this word. Among the opening salutations of St Paul's Epistles it is only found in those addressed to Timothy.

*and upon the Israel of God*] More correctly, "**even** upon the Israel of God." Those who have been mentioned above constitute the Christian Israel. The application of the word "Israel" in this way is frequent in the New Testament. See John i. 47; Rom. ix. 6; Eph. ii. 12, and especially 1 Cor. x. 18, where "Israel after the flesh" is used to mark the antithesis between the old Hebrew nation and its spiritual Christian counterpart. The remark of Bishop Lightfoot must not be overlooked, that perhaps there is here a "reference to the benediction, which closes Psalms cxxv., cxxviii., and which must have been a familiar sound in the ears of all devout Israelites."

### 17. Conclusion.

Once more St Paul makes a peremptory assertion of his Apostolic authority.

**17.** *I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus*] The literal reference is to the marks which his body bore of suffering and ill-usage in the cause of Christ. These marks he designates by the name of *brands,* such as were borne by slaves. The Master, to whom he belongs, and whose ownership is indicated by these brands, is Christ. See Acts xxvii. 23. In the word "bear" there is almost a triumphant expression. He is proud of these marks of indignity, because they are proofs of his belonging to Christ. "He says," remarks Chrysostom, "not simply I have these marks, but I bear them about, like one exulting in a trophy."

**18.** *Brethren*] See vi. 1. In the original Greek this word is the last word of all: and, as Bengel says, "this alleviates the severe tone of the whole Epistle."

*the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit*] It is the higher part of man—the "potior pars" of the old Theologians—on which Divine grace operates.

Digitized by Google

# EPHESIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



### I. *St Paul at Ephesus.*

EPHESUS, the capital of Proconsular Asia, and the head-quarters of the worship of Artemis, was the centre of a magnificent but corrupt provincial civilisation when St Paul paid it his first visit. The Apostle had felt a strong desire to proceed thither early in his Second Missionary Journey (Acts xvi. 6), but being overruled by a divine impulse, he had passed over into Europe for the evangelisation of Macedonia and Achaia; and he was unable to carry out his original design of establishing Christianity in Asia, or even to visit its capital, until on his return journey from Corinth to Jerusalem the vessel in which he was voyaging stopped for a few days, probably for lading purposes, in the harbour of Ephesus. The time during which he was thus detained comprised within it a Sabbath-day, which gave him the desired opportunity of preaching in the Synagogue to the Jews, of whom a considerable number had settled in Ephesus, probably at the time of the conquest of Judæa by Pompey[1]. They besought him to continue his address on the following Sabbath, but being unable to comply, he promised to return, if it were God's will, and he left behind him Aquila and Priscilla to carry on the work which his one day's preaching had begun (Acts xviii. 19—21, 26).

In his Third Missionary Journey St Paul fulfilled this promise, and carried out his original purpose. Having travelled from Antioch through Galatia and Phrygia (Acts xviii. 22, 23), he arrived at Ephesus (*Ib.* xix. 1), and made it his head-quarters for three years (*Ib.* xx. 31), during which time he devoted himself to the evangelization of the city and the district of which it was the metropolis. For the first three months he addressed himself to the Jewish Synagogue in Ephesus, but after that time, in consequence of the opposition that he there met with, he formed in Tyrannus' lecture-room a separate congregation of Ephesian Christians, composed of Jewish and Gentile converts, whom he constituted into an organised Church under regularly ordained pastors and teachers (*Ib.* xx. 28). But his purpose from the beginning had been not to confine himself to Ephesus, but to "preach the word in Asia" (*Ib.* xvi. 6), and accordingly he made excursions from the metropolis to all parts of the province, forming Churches in the chief towns and cities, "so that all they which dwelt in Asia" (that is, speaking broadly, the western part of Asia Minor), "heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (*Ib.* xix. 10); and Demetrius was led to say that "not alone in Ephe-

[1] See Professor Plumptre's 'St Paul in Asia Minor,' p. 104; and Josephus, 'Antiq.' XIV. 10, 12, 25.

Digitized by Google

sus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people" (*Ib.* xix. 26). At the end of the three years St Paul proceeded to Greece, and on his return once more towards the East, after holding an interview with the Ephesian Presbyters at Miletus, he travelled on to Jerusalem, whence he was carried as a prisoner to Cæsarea and Rome.

### II. *St Paul's Epistles from Rome.*

During the first part of his imprisonment at Rome, St Paul was probably occupied so fully by the religious needs of the capital of the world, that he left the various Churches, which he had founded, to the care of those to whom he had entrusted them on the spot. But towards the close of his two years' captivity he wrote four Epistles—to the Philippians, to Philemon, to the Colossians, to the Ephesians. Of these the three latter were written at almost the same time: whether the Epistle to the Philippians preceded or followed them is uncertain (see 'Introduction to the Epistle to the Philippians'). The three contemporaneous Epistles were conveyed to Asia by Tychicus and Onesimus, Onesimus carrying the letter to his master Philemon, and Tychicus being entrusted with the Epistle addressed specially to the Colossians, and with a circular or encyclical letter, which he was to take first to Ephesus, and then to the various cities of Asia in which St Paul had formed Churches during his three years' residence at Ephesus. One copy of this Epistle was headed "To the saints that are at Ephesus;" the others, "To the saints that are..." the lacuna having to be filled up by Tychicus, either by word of mouth or with the pen, in each city wherein he read or delivered up the Epistle.

### III. *To whom the Epistle was addressed.*

We are justified in stating the above to have been the destination of the "Epistle to the Ephesians," no longer as a doubtful conjecture, but as a probability amounting almost to a certainty, for it is the only hypothesis which accounts in a satisfactory manner for the facts which have to be taken into consideration. The facts are the following:—

1. The vast majority of the MSS. and all the versions contain the words "in Ephesus," and the general Church tradition in the earliest ages was to the effect that the Epistle was addressed to the Ephesians. See Irenæus, 'Adv. Hær.' v. 2, 3; Clemens Alex. 'Strom.' IV. 8, 'Pædag.' I. 5; Tertull. 'De Monog.' c. v. On the other hand (*a*) two of the best MSS. (the Vatican and the Sinaitic Codex) have not the words "in Ephesus" in the text. (*b*) Origen's copies appear to have wanted them, though he regarded the Epistle as addressed to the Ephesians (see Cramer's 'Catena,' Ox. p. 102): Basil testifies that "the old copies" in his day were without them ('Contra Eunom.' II. 19): Jerome's words probably, but by no means certainly, imply that there was the same diversity of reading in the MSS. which he employed ('Ad Ephes.' i. 1): Tertullian states that the Church witnessed truly to the Epistle having been addressed to the Ephesians, and that it was inscribed accordingly; but that Marcion had at one time a desire (*aliquando gestiit*) to alter the title into "The Epistle to the Laodiceans," in order to shew what a diligent investigator he had been; and that the heretics had it so inscribed ('Adv. Marc.' v. 11, 17). These variations in the MSS. and this hesitancy in ecclesiastical tradition would be only natural upon the hypothesis of a circular letter having several different addresses, one of which was "To the Laodiceans:" they are not explicable on the theory of an Epistle addressed solely either to the Ephesians or to the Laodiceans.

2. (*a*) St Paul, though he had lived for three years at Ephesus (a longer time than that which he spent in any other city except Antioch), sends no greetings or messages to individual Christians from himself or others. This is contrary to his general though not to his universal custom (cf. the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Galatians, which are without them); nor is this lack of special salutations accounted for either by the curious argument of Lardner (Vol. VI. p. 144), that as he addressed many persons in Rome where he had not been,

Digitized by Google

he might address none at Ephesus where he had been; or by Eadie's suggestion that he knew too many to address by name; or by the supposition that the private messages were to be given by Tychicus, for Tychicus was enjoined to give information about St Paul at Colossæ as at Ephesus (Col. iv. 7), and yet there are individual salutations in the Epistle to the Colossians. The encyclical character of the Epistle would at once explain their absence. (*b*) The following passages occur in the Epistle: "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you" (i. 15). "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward" (iii. 2). "As I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ" (iii. 4). "Remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles" (ii. 11). None of these texts are incompatible with the theory of the Epistle being addressed exclusively to the Ephesians (see notes on each of them); but their wording appears more natural if we understand St Paul to be writing to some at least whom he did not know, and who did not know him as the Ephesians did (Acts xx. 38), and to a body which on the whole consisted of more Gentiles than we have reason to believe was the case in the city of Ephesus.

3. We may further note, (*a*) St Paul desires the Colossians, after they have read the Epistle addressed to themselves, to send it to Laodicea and to fetch thence the Epistle that was there ("the Epistle *from* Laodicea"). Tychicus in carrying the two letters would naturally have landed at Ephesus, and taking the copies of the Ephesian or circular Epistle with him, would have left a copy with the Laodiceans just before reaching Colossæ with the Epistle to the Colossians. It is a reasonable conclusion that St Paul's injunction refers to this circular letter, which he wished the Colossians to read after they had profited by their own more controversial Epistle. The copy then left at Laodicea may have been the very copy addressed to the Laodiceans which Marcion saw or heard of in the course of his ecclesiastical researches.

(*b*) Writing from Ephesus to the Corinthians, St Paul sends the salutations not of the Ephesian Church, but of "the Churches of Asia." This incidentally shews that the Church of the metropolis and the Churches of the province of Asia were closely connected together in his mind, so that he might well have addressed an epistle to them in common. And this identification was not peculiar to him: the Temple of Artemis was considered to be the Temple of Asia, the Ephesians being only its wardens in behalf of the province.

(*c*) St Paul addresses the Second Epistle to the Corinthians "unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." Thus we see that it was not contrary to his custom in addressing the Church of the metropolis to address also the Churches of the province.

(*d*) In Eph. vi. 21, St Paul writes, "But that ye *also* may know my affairs and how I do, Tychicus," &c. This "ye also" will bear other interpretations (see note *ad loc.*), but it may refer to the inhabitants of the several cities to which Tychicus went after he had left Ephesus.

(*e*) There is an encyclical character about the Epistle which is not shared by other Epistles. It consists of a dogmatic statement of the Christian Faith (and consequently of Christian practice) with special reference to the difficulties not of any one Church, but of all Churches composed of Jews and Gentiles—that is, of all the Pauline Churches.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above evidence, external, internal, and corroborative, is that the Epistle was not addressed to the Laodiceans, as has been held among others by Grotius, Mill, Dupin, Wake, Paley, Greswell, Holzausen; nor to the Ephesians alone, as held by most of the older commentators, and in later times by Lardner, Davidson, Alford, Wordsworth, Meyer; but to the Ephesians and to the other Christians of Asia, according to the idea first suggested by Archbishop Ussher, and followed by the majority of succeeding critics, such as Michaelis, Eichhorn, Schneckenburger, Neander,

Digitized by Google

Bengel, Harless, Olshausen, Howson, Ellicott, Barry, Lightfoot.

IV. *Whence written and when.*

That the Epistle was written from Rome during St Paul's first imprisonment may be taken as proved. The only ground for questioning it is the authority of . Meyer, who with a few other German critics defends the conjecture of Schulz, that it was written from Cæsarea. But the utmost that the argument in favour of this hypothesis substantiates, is a possibility of the Epistle having been written during the imprisonment at Cæsarea, in face of a far greater probability in favour of Rome. The order in which the four Epistles of the Captivity were written cannot be determined. Bishop Lightfoot (Introd. to the Epistle to the Philippians) has changed the current opinion as to the date of the Epistle to the Philippians relatively to the other three. It is probable that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written within the same fortnight, the special dangers to which the Colossians were exposed leading the Apostle to write a special letter to them, while at the same time he desired them to procure from Laodicea the general Epistle for the Churches of Asia, which he had just written, or was just about to write.

V. *Its purpose and subject.*

More important than the question of its exact date is the determination of the full object and purpose of the Apostle in writing the Epistle. And this is the more necessary as many commentators of great merit have failed to grasp the leading thought of the Apostle, and represent the Epistle to be a treatise on the unity of the Catholic Church. It does treat of the unity of the Church, but only as a corollary to the greater question which it has discussed and solved.

The battle for the doctrine of Justification by Faith had been fought and won in the impassioned attack upon the bewitched Galatians, and the majestic argument addressed to the Romans, and in the other Epistles forming the earlier group of St Paul's writings. Now this great doctrine had fallen into the background, not because it was less regarded by St Paul, but because his converts, as a rule, had accepted it, and therefore there was not the same need of his still enforcing it with the Apostolic vehemence which was at first required. In writing to the Philippians indeed he again falls back upon the earlier theme with revived earnestness, but this was either because there were some among the Philippians, for whom he knew that such teaching was still needed, or, as Bishop Lightfoot has argued, because that Epistle was an earlier composition than the three other Epistles of the Captivity. In the Epistle to the Ephesians we hear nothing of Justification by Faith: the doctrine takes the shape of Salvation by Grace, and it is introduced as an axiom to which the writer contemplated no opposition, first parenthetically in three words (ii. 5) and then by an expansion of the parenthesis in two verses (ii. 8, 9).

But another question had now grown up, which called for the Apostle's treatment—a question which could not but arise in all the Churches founded by St Paul, and through them in the mother Church of Jerusalem likewise. The Pauline Churches consisted of Jews and Gentiles; and though St Paul's turning to the Gentiles, when the Gospel message was scorned by the Jews, would have appeared at the moment only natural to enthusiastic disciples, yet there were involved in such a step intellectual difficulties to both old and new converts, which in calmer times would have to be faced and solved. These difficulties would take different forms to the Jew and to the Gentile, but they would be felt by the more thoughtful of both classes. "Is it possible," would be the question of the Jewish Christian, "that the privilege of being the peculiar people of God, which has belonged to us since the days of Abraham, is to be no longer ours? that it is to be shared by all comers, or—still more difficult to be believed—by those whom Paul chooses to address? Has our vaunted privilege been untrue all along—a mere piece of national vanity? If so, Judaism, and with it the very idea of a kingdom of the Messiah disappears; if not, how can I be assured that God has changed

Digitized by Google

His plan? Nay further, if He has changed it, does not that very change argue that the previous dispensation was a mistake and therefore not divine; and then again how can its testimony be used as evidence of Christ's claims?" The Gentile on the other hand would ask: "Is it possible that for two thousand years God's kingdom should have been confined to one insignificant nation? Where was the wisdom or the goodness of God there? or if it was wise and good, how is it wise and good now to make so radical a change? What evidence have I that it has been made? And besides, how can it be just that a few dwellers in Cyprus, in Philippi, in Athens, in Corinth, in Ephesus should have the offer of this great salvation now offered to them, while the rest of the world remains as before in its darkness, if it be darkness? Can such a stupendous fact as the reconciliation of man to God by the Incarnation and Death of his Son be true, and none have had an insight into such a scheme of salvation beforehand except Jews, and none be sharers in it now except those to whom Paul and his associates preach?" We can hardly realize the stumblingblock which the long concealment of the Gospel from the world in general, and now the apparently haphazard communication of it to such as might seemingly chance to come in contact with it, must have caused to the early Gentile Christians. St Paul in the quietude of his Roman imprisonment had opportunity to meet these intellectual difficulties of his converts. To do so, he propounds no new theory, but he systematises the scattered arguments of his previous Epistles, and having embodied them in a general Epistle, sends Tychicus with it to Ephesus and the other cities of Proconsular Asia—the district in which above all others the thoughts of East and West were jostling and clashing against each other, and striking out strange systems of Gnostic Theosophy.

The first perplexity, common to the Jew and Gentile, which he deals with in it, is that of a change of mind on the part of God. There was none. Before the foundation of the world, in the depths of Eternity, God had purposed and ordained all. Then He had determined the nationality of the Jewish, the Catholicity of the Christian, Kingdom. Then He had foreordained the moment of time at which that Adoption in Christ should take place, which was now for the first time being realized in fact (i. 4, 5). The charge of want of wisdom, proved by a change of purpose, fell to the ground when it appeared that no change of purpose had occurred. But God's wisdom was not like man's—a wisdom easily apprehended by man's faculties: the depth of His wisdom and knowledge was unsearchable, His ways past finding out (Rom. xi. 33); He used all wisdom and prudence (see note on Eph. i. 8), but His wisdom was manifold, multiform, πολυποίκιλος (iii. 10); it took one shape from the time of Adam to Abraham, another from Abraham to Moses, another from Moses to Christ, and yet another in the period which was now beginning. Unwise it might seem when looked upon in any one of its parts, but regard it as a whole and its majestic wisdom became apparent, calling forth the admiration and adoring love of angels and men.

For assurance of the truth of the Predestination in Eternity and the Adoption in time, St Paul falls back on his own veracity and authority. He solemnly declares that it had been revealed directly from God to him, and that it was his great glory to be the instrument in God's hands of making known this mystery, which had been till now concealed, and of carrying out the divine purpose by offering the free gift of salvation to the Gentiles equally with the Jews. They knew him—the unwearied missionary who "by the space of three years ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears" (Acts xx. 31), and when those years were over had claimed to be "pure from the blood of all men," on the ground that he had "not shunned to declare unto them all the counsel of God" (*Ib.* 26, 27); and he boldly challenged their belief in his assertion, because he made it, that "God had by revelation made known unto him the mystery, that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ by the Gospel" (Eph. iii. 3—6); and that the Apostolate of the Gentiles was conferred on him by God, "to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery, which from the beginning of

Digitized by Google

the world had been hid in God" (iii. 9). St Paul's claim of inspiration might be rejected, as the claim of any other prophet or expositor of the divine counsels might be rejected, but those who accepted his testimony found in it an explanation of the difficulties which were painfully pressing upon them. If they could feel confident that God had willed that the Jews alone should at first be His covenant people, and that now (the unbelieving Jews being rejected) the Gentiles should be taken into covenant with Him, they would acquiesce in that will; and this confidence they derived from St Paul's testimony. This point once settled, minor difficulties would settle themselves. That a few Greeks, Romans and Asiatics should be selected as the recipients of the call, would comparatively cease to be perplexing, if they were looked upon as the first fruits of the whole Gentile world, to which the same call was to be made, if not by St Paul, by St Paul's successors; and the plea that thus God willed it, as testified by His Apostle, was valid here too, and would at least silence objections raised by "the forward faculty" of imagination, even if it could not remove them.

The great subject then of the Epistle is the Adoption in Christ, as predetermined by God from all eternity, and now revealed by God to St Paul, and by him made known to mankind. Whatever intellectual difficulties there are, and always must be, in reconciling the Predestination of God with the Liberty of Man's Will, the conditions under which the grace of Adoption becomes available for each individual are declared to be, for Jews and Greeks without distinction, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts xx. 21), sealed by the sacrament of baptism, in which was given, not indeed the full fruition, but the earnest, of the Holy Spirit (Eph. i. 13, 14). Thus were those who accepted God's call gathered together in one in Christ (i. 10, 22); instead of aliens they were made nigh, instead of strangers and lodgers they became citizens of God's city and members of His household, and were built up into a living temple in the Lord (ii. 12—22). This doctrinal exposition naturally leads to a fervent prayer that they may be all strengthened by the Spirit, and an earnest exhortation to preserve the harmony of the building, the unity of the body, which they in common and equally constituted, whether they had been Jews or Gentiles. But the lesson of the Unity of the Church is not so much the aim of the Epistle as that of its Catholicity—and even that is not its direct aim. From the great doctrine of the Adoption follows immediately the doctrine of the Catholicity of the Church; and from the Catholicity of the Church follows the duty of striving to maintain its Unity, seeing that the peril of disruption, which had rent even the Hebrew Church, was a thousandfold increased by a change of constitution which potentially admitted to full membership men infinite in number, diverse in disposition, and opposed to each other in prejudices. In view of this peril the Apostle urges upon his converts lowliness, meekness, long-suffering, forbearance, love, unity, peace (iv. 2, 3), and enumerates those common possessions—one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Father, one ministry of the Spirit—which shew that all Christians, as such, are one, and which ought to serve as motives to them to continue at one together (iv. 4—16).

## VI. *Analysis of contents.*

I. 1, 2. Salutation.

3—14. Thanksgiving for the Adoption in Christ, and the consequent gift of the earnest of the Holy Spirit to those who by faith accepted the offer of salvation, and were thereupon admitted into covenant.

15—23, II. 1—10. Thanksgiving for their faith and love (without which the dispensation of the Adoption in Christ would have been of no avail to them individually), and prayer for their further enlightenment as to their hope, their inheritance, and God's power in raising them from the death of sin, as He had raised Christ from the dead.

11—22. Reminder of the privileges to which Gentiles had attained by the Adoption in Christ, and by the Reconciliation wrought by Him between man and man and between man and God.

III. 1—13. Solemn Declaration that the mystery of the extension of God's

Digitized by Google

kingdom to the Gentiles had been revealed by God to him, Paul; and that he had been divinely commissioned to bear these good tidings to the Gentiles.

14—21. Prayer that, as God's family, they may be animated and strengthened by the Spirit of God and the indwelling of Christ.

IV. 1—16. Exhortation to unity in that Church in which Jew and Gentile were equally constituent elements, bound together by the same doctrines, the same rites and the same ministry.

17—32, V. 1—21. Exhortation to moral conduct and piety, on the ground of having been adopted in Christ and regenerated.

21—33, VI. 1—9. The relative duties of Christian husbands and wives (v. 23—33), parents and children (vi. 1—4), masters and slaves (5—9).

10—18. The Christian Panoply.

19, 20. Request for their prayers.

21—24. Conclusion and final salutation.

## VII. *The genuineness of the Epistle.*

It is not necessary to linger over the proofs of the authorship of the Epistle, as no attempt worth controverting has been made to impugn its authenticity. Critics and commentators have, almost in a body, agreed to regard the two Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians in the light of twin productions of the same mind, bearing witness each to the other's genuineness by their many points of likeness and unlikeness, as has been drawn out with much patience and ingenuity in Paley's 'Horæ Paulinæ[1].' It has indeed been maintained that both of the Epistles are proved to be non-Pauline in doctrine and in date by being tainted with the errors of Gnosticism[1]. That there are in both of them words which became technical terms in Gnostic Theosophy is undoubted, but that those words are used in such a way as to teach the doctrines of Gnostic Theosophy is untrue; and putting all other evidence of the genuineness of the Epistles aside, it is much more credible that some of these technical words were adopted by the Gnostics from St Paul, while others were deliberately employed by St Paul, in order to correct and guard against the nascent errors which afterwards developed themselves, than that they were borrowed, as they stand, from the full-blown system of Valentinus.

Internal evidence is generally of a nature which admits of different conclusions according to the different prepossessions of the person to whom it is submitted or by whom it is constructed. External evidence is of a tougher character, and in the present case the force of this evidence is overwhelming. There is an allusion to iv. 4—6 in Clement of Rome, 'Epist. ad Corinth.' c. xlvi.; a plain reference to the whole Epistle in Ignatius, 'Epist. ad Ephes.' c. xii. (a passage whose interpretation is not in all points free from uncertainty); a citation of iv. 26 (unless it be of Ps. iv. 4, where the same words occur) in Polycarp, 'Epist. ad Philipp.' c. xii.; a recognition of the Epistle in the Muratorian Canon; in Irenæus, 'Adv. Hær.' v. 2, 3; in Clement of Alexandria, 'Pædag.' I. 5; 'Strom.' IV. 8; in Tertullian, 'Adv. Marc.' V. 11, 17; and by so unanimous a consent of later but still ancient ecclesiastical authorities that it ceases to be worth while to enumerate them.

[1] De Wette, on grounds mainly subjective, regards this Epistle as a wordy paraphrase of the Epistle to the Colossians, written by a disciple of St Paul, whose mind was of a calibre altogether inferior to that of the Apostle. It is enough to say that De Wette is singular in this opinion of the inferiority of the Epistle to the acknowledged compositions of St Paul, and that on such a point singularity is fatal to his theory; for if there had really been such a difference of quality between the two Epistles as he imagines, others would have been struck by it as well as himself.

[1] Baur.

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE

TO THE

# EPHESIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *After the salutation,* 3 *and thanksgiving for the Ephesians,* 4 *he treateth of our election,* 6 *and adoption by grace,* 11 *which is the true and proper fountain of man's salvation.* 13 *And because the height of this mystery cannot easily be attained unto,* 16 *he prayeth that they may come* 18 *to the full knowledge and* 20 *possession thereof in Christ.*

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus:

2 Grace *be* to you, and peace, from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.

3 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly [1] *places* in Christ:

[1] Or, things.

4 According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

---

CHAP. I. 1, 2. SALUTATION.

Cf. Col. i. 1, 2.

**1.** *by the will of God*] St Paul affirms the divine origin of his Apostleship at the commencement of every Epistle except those addressed to the Thessalonians, to Philemon and to the Philippians. The phrase here used occurs in 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1.

*to the saints*] St Paul addresses "the saints" in all his Epistles except 1 and 2 Thess. and Gal., and those written to individuals. The word is first found as an appellation equivalent to "Christians" in Acts ix. 13.

*at Ephesus*] See Introduction, § 3.

*and to the faithful...*] **and faithful in Christ Jesus**, the same persons being meant as those already designated by the title of "saints." This form of address is used only in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, written about the same time.

3—14. THANKSGIVING FOR THE ADOPTION IN CHRIST AND THE CONSEQUENT GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. Cf. Col. i. 3, 6, 12, 13, 20, 22, 26, 27.

**3.** *who hath blessed us*] **who blessed us.** A definite act of blessing is in the Apostle's mind, though that one act of blessing contained within it every Christian blessing.

*with all spiritual blessings*] blessings and graces derived from the Spirit of God and flowing into the souls of men, including, says Theodoret, the assurance of Resurrection, Immortality, Inheritance, Adoption. The allusion to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity naturally follows on the First and Second Persons having been named. We are blessed by the Father, in the Son, with the gifts of the Spirit.

*in heavenly places*] Lit. "in the heavenly." The four other passages in the epistle (i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12) in which the expression occurs shew that the A.V. is right in supplying the substantive "places;" the "heavenly places" however would not mean the local heavens but the spiritual world, to which the kingdom of heaven, whether in its present or its future form, equally belongs. Cf. Phil. iii. 20.

*in Christ*] As Christians, and through the mystical incorporation with Him which results from the Adoption.

**4.** *as he hath chosen us*] **as He chose us.** A definite act of choice in eternity, preceding that of blessing in time, is pointed to; and the choice was even then made "in Him," that is, those chosen for adoption were so chosen for the sake of Christ, with whom they would in the future be united as their Head.

*before the foundation of the world*] Not only when Christ came, or even when man fell, but before man or man's residence was created, or time existed, God resolved that admission to covenant with Himself, having been for a period confined to one nation, should on Christ's coming in the flesh be offered, potentially to all other nations, actually to those persons whether Jews or Gentiles to whom it was in fact offered by the preaching of the Apostles.

*that we should be holy and without blame before him in love*] To "be holy and without blame," or rather, like a sacrifice, "without

Digitized by Google

5 Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will,

6 To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.

7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

8 Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence;

9 Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself:

10 That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in [†]heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him:

11 In whom also we have obtained

† Gr. *the heavens.*

---

blemish (which is the more exact rendering) before God," are the results which are intended to follow upon the choice made in eternity being realized by adoption in Christ, and which do follow upon it unless men fall away from grace given. The words "in love" are joined by some with the succeeding clause, "In love having predestinated us."

**5.** *the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself*] This is the keynote of the Epistle. See Introduction, § 5.

*the good pleasure of his will*] The word employed in the original (like its English equivalent) sometimes contains within it the idea of benignity, sometimes not. Here the context determines that it is His will alone which is signified by it. God's will is the ultimate cause to which we can penetrate.

**6.** *To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted*] that is, to the end that praise may accrue to Him from the manifestation of the glorious nature of this grace of adoption which He freely bestowed upon us. The words translated "wherein he hath made us accepted," should rather be rendered **which He graciously bestowed upon us.**

*in the beloved*] See Matt. iii. 17; Col. i. 13.

**7.** *through his blood*] This verse teaches dogmatically that man's deliverance and the forgiveness of sins are wrought by the means of redemption, and that the price paid to effect the redemption is Christ's blood. Cf. Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; Acts xx. 28; Gal. iii. 13; Heb. ix. 22; 1 Pet. i. 19.

**8.** *Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence*] Rather, "which he caused to abound towards us in all wisdom and prudence." These two words express the highest intellectual and moral wisdom. Both are elsewhere in Holy Scripture predicated of God with reference to the creation (Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 12), and here they refer to God, not man. (See De Wette and Alford *in loc.*) It is the Apostle's purpose to vindicate God's wisdom in its intellectual and moral aspects in the matter of the mystery with which this Epistle specially deals. See Introduction, § 5.

**9.** *unto us*] St Paul refers back to this verse in iii. 3, and expressing the same thought uses there the singular number. Here he speaks not only of himself, as there, but of all who had received the adoption in Christ.

*the mystery of his will*] the mystery which He had willed, which came into existence because He willed it, and continued in its original inscrutable character until it was His good pleasure to reveal it. The word mystery is used in the sense of a thing that was beyond human comprehension until revealed. What the mystery was is explained in the next verse.

*which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times*] **which He purposed in Himself in respect to the dispensation of the fulness of times.** The dispensation is the Divine arrangement of His household, or plan of government, which was to be carried out when the full time had come, which time had now arrived.

**10.** *he might gather together in one*] Hitherto the scattered family of mankind had had no head under which all its members might range themselves, but this head was now found in Christ, nay more, not only the family of mankind was thus bound together in one, but angelic beings also, aye, everything in heaven and earth, the whole created universe; and not only have all things found their head, but they are so summed up in Christ as to be regarded by the Father as "in Him," and because "in Him," acceptable. See Rev. v. 13. There is no thought here of a final restitution of all things; the time designated is that of the institution of Christianity.

**11.** *we have obtained an inheritance*] **we obtained an inheritance** by our adoption in Christ, viz. that "inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us" (1 Pet. i. 4), typified by the inheritance of Canaan promised to the descendants of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 8), which had



Digitized by Google

an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:

12 That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first [1]trusted in Christ.

[1] Or, *hoped.*

13 In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise,

14 Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.

15 Wherefore I also, after I heard

---

hitherto been regarded as the exclusive possession of the Jews. This interpretation is preferable to the alternative rendering "we became God's inheritance," which would connect the phrase with Ex. xix. 5, 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9. See below on verses 14 and 18.

**12.** *That we should be to the praise of his glory*] This is the final purpose with which believers in Christ are admitted to the hope, and receive the earnest, of the sacred inheritance.

*who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word*] The construction is involved in a manner very characteristic of St Paul's style. Had he kept back the utterance of his thought sufficiently long to express it with grammatical precision, it would have run as follows—"that we should be to the praise of his glory, both we who have long since had this hope in Christ before our eyes, and you who became believers as soon as you heard the word of truth, the good news of your salvation, preached to you, and were thereupon sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance." The translation should be—**we who have hoped in Christ before you—in whom ye also, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation—in whom ye also (*I say*) having believed, were sealed**, &c. St Paul is not contrasting the Jewish and the Gentile believers; he speaks in the first place of Christians in general—"that *we* should be"—and then, for the sake of amplification, he divides this "we" into the two parts which constitute it—the "we, who have long since had hope in Christ," and the "you who were afterwards sealed," that is, the old and the new believers. The adverb "first" in the expression "first trusted (or rather, hoped) in Christ" does not mean "before Christ came," but "before the later converts." The word "trusted" should not be supplied in verse 13; the verb is found a little lower down in "were sealed."

*ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise*] After they had been converted to the faith by the preaching of the Gospel, they were sealed in baptism with the promised gift of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is referred to as "the promise of the Father" in Acts i. 4 and seems to have been spoken of by the first Christians under the name of "the promise." He had been promised by the ancient prophets (see Joel ii. 28—32) and still more emphatically by Christ (see John xiv., xv., xvi.). Baptism is "the seal," because to the adult it is the final act proving and confirming conversion to Christianity, and because it impresses a spiritual mark upon the recipients, notifying that they are "the servants of God" (Rev. vii. 3).

**14.** *Which is the earnest of our inheritance*] The gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed on earth is not the full outpouring of Himself, but a partial gift (like the part purchase-money given as an earnest of the rest), implying however (unless lost) the full inheritance or possession of Him hereafter, which constitutes the final bliss of the Christian. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 22, where "the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" is connected, as here, with our being "sealed," and also with our being "anointed," both of which latter phrases point to baptism and its immediate complement, confirmation. See Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' Vol. III. s.v. Baptism and Confirmation.

*until the redemption*] Rather, "unto," that is, "with a view to the redemption," the words being construed with "ye were sealed." If the rendering "until" be adopted, they must be constructed with "the earnest," as in the A. V.

*the redemption of the purchased possession*] The partial gift of the Spirit on earth is preparatory to the greater gift of a future perfect redemption or deliverance, which is only attained in its fulness when God's purchased creature, redeemed man, has passed from this life to the next. The "purchased possession" is the same thing as the "peculiar or purchased people" of 1 Pet. ii. 9.

15—23, ii. 1—10. THANKSGIVING FOR THEIR FAITH AND LOVE: PRAYER FOR THEIR FURTHER ENLIGHTENMENT RESPECTING (I) THEIR HOPE, (II) THEIR INHERITANCE, (III) GOD'S POWER IN RAISING THEM FROM THE DEATH OF SIN. Cf. Col. i. 3, 4, 5, 9, ii. 13.

**15.** *Wherefore*] This refers back to verse 13, and specially to the words "ye believed."

Digitized by Google

of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints,

16 Cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers;

17 That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation [1]in the knowledge of him:

18 The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints,

19 And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working [†]of his mighty power,

20 Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set *him* at his own right hand in the heavenly *places*,

21 Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and

[1] Or, *for the acknowledgment.*

[†] Gr. *of the might of his power.*

---

*I also*] That is, "I, and not only I." Perhaps he refers specially to his informant.

*after I heard of your faith*] St Paul must either mean by their "faith" their stedfastness in the faith, or the Epistle could not have been addressed (solely) to the Ephesians, whom he had himself evangelized. Cf. Philem. 5. See Introduction, § 3.

**17.** *the God of our Lord Jesus Christ*] An unusual expression, probably employed in place of the more common form, "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"—because the word Father immediately follows in the Hebraism "the Father of glory." Our Lord speaks of the Father as His God in John xx. 17, and St Paul uses the expression "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" in this Epistle (i. 3).

*the Father of glory*] From whom all glory proceeds, and in whom it resides in perfect form. Cf. the phrase "Father of mercies" (2 Cor. i. 3), "Father of lights" (James i. 17).

*the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him*] that spirit of illumination and insight which looks through the outward coverings that conceal God from the earthly mind, and gives full knowledge of Him by revealing His glory lying beneath them. The spirit of wisdom (1 Cor. xii. 8) and of revelation (1 Cor. xiv. 26) and of knowledge (1 Cor. xii. 8) are imparted by the Spirit of God (1 Cor. xii. 11).

**18.** *The eyes of your understanding*] **The eyes of your heart**, according to the reading of all the best MSS. and versions. Light is represented as pervading the whole body, Matt. vi. 22; and as emanating from Christ, John i. 9, viii. 12. The expression "eyes of the heart" is used by Clemens Romanus, 'Epist.' I. 36.

*what is the hope of his calling*] the hope of eternal life, conveyed to them when they received and listened to God's call (verse 13). In the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Colossians it is called "the hope that is laid up for you in heaven." Col. i. 5.

*his inheritance in the saints*] By "his inheritance" must be understood "the (heavenly) inheritance given by Him," and "in the saints" means, as in Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18, "among them that are sanctified." See verse 11.

**19.** *his power*] This is the third thing about which St Paul prays that they may have greater knowledge; 1. Eternal life. 2. Future inheritance. 3. God's power in raising them from the death of sin to the Christian life.

*according to the working of his mighty power*] The power that God manifested in raising Christ from the dead, the same or a similar power He exerts upon us, raising us up who were dead in trespasses and sins. Cf. Ignatius 'Ad Trall.' c. 9, and Pearson, 'Exp. of the Creed,' Art. v. *sub fin.*

The thought begun in i. 19 is completed in ii. 1, 4—6, verses 20—23 being a parenthetical enlargement on the glories of Christ, and verses 2, 3 of chap. ii. on the sinfulness of man, by both of which parentheses the flow of the sentence is suspended.

20—23 (parenthetical). The Glories of Christ's Exaltation. Cf. Col. i. 16—19, ii. 9, 10.

**20.** *at his own right hand*] Holy Scripture represents Christ in heaven as sitting at the right hand of God (Mark xvi. 19; Heb. viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2; Col. iii. 1), and this representation not only indicates His majesty, but teaches us that His work of Reconciliation has been fully accomplished by His one sacrifice offered once for all and for ever upon the Cross, after which "He took His seat" (Heb. x. 12), "He hath taken His seat" (*Ib.* xii. 2), on God's Right Hand.

**21.** *principality, and power, and might, and dominion*] the angelic hierarchy, as in iii. 10; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Pet. iii. 22. In vi. 12 the same titles are given to the evil spirits. They are adopted by Milton for the fallen angels in 'Paradise Lost,' II. 11, 310, and for the unfallen in v. 611, 772. Classifications of the angels are to be found in Origen, Basil of Seleucia, Ephrem Syrus, and Pseudo-Dionysius. St Augustine refrains from entering on



Digitized by Google

every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:

22 And hath put all *things* under his feet, and gave him *to be* the head over all *things* to the church,

23 Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

---

the task of explaining titles the full force of which he allows that he does not know ('Enchiridion,' c. lviii.).

*every name that is named*] "every dignity (whether real or imaginary) which is reverenced" (Lightfoot).

*in this world...in that which is to come*] that is, in the present period up to the second coming of Christ, and in the period that will succeed it.

**22.** *hath put all things under his feet*] A quotation from Ps. viii. 6, shewing incidentally St Paul's apprehension of the Messianic application of that Psalm. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 27; Heb. ii. 8. Read, **and put all things under his feet**, omitting "hath."

*gave*] See iv. 11. Christ is the gift of God to the Church, for the Church's head, as the ministry of the Spirit is the gift of Christ to it, for its edification.

*the head over all things to the church*] He is exalted above every created thing, but to the Church He is the head, not merely in the sense of ruler or chief, but the mystical head of a mystical body, which derives its life and energy from union with its head. See Bp Beveridge 'Serm.' XXXII. This now familiar representation of the head and the body is here first made in both its parts. See the difference in the earlier epistles, Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 27.

**23.** *the fulness*] This word is to be referred not, as is usually done, to the Church, but to Christ. The object of these four parenthetical verses is to declare the glories which God wrought in Christ. They are His Resurrection, His Session, His supreme Dominion over all things, His Headship of the Church. Having enumerated these, the Apostle proceeds to name the greatest of all—urged also in the contemporary Epistle to the Colossians—He is the fulness of (*i.e.* He is filled to the full with) that Godhead which filleth all in all; in other words, "in Him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9). Translate, "And Him He gave to be the Head over all things to His body the Church—Him who is the fulness of that which filleth all in all." See Note at the end of the Chapter.

*of him that filleth all*] Or, "of that which filleth all," *i.e.* all things. It is exclusively a Divine quality to fill all things by an ubiquitous presence. This quality is here asserted of the Godhead, of which Christ is the fulness, because He possesses the whole sum of Its powers, qualities and attributes. The same claim is made for Christ in iv. 10, "that He might fill all things."

*in all*] Either "in all respects" or "in all places," that is, either "altogether" or "everywhere." The meaning of the whole verse is that He, who is given to be the Head of the Church, is none other than He that has in Himself the totality of the properties of the Godhead, whose quality it is to fill all things everywhere with blessings and with everything that can be required or possessed by them.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on CHAP. I. 22, 23.

*Καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου.*

1. The key to the theological sense in which the word *πλήρωμα* is used in the New Testament is found in John i. 14, 16, *Ὁ λόγος ...ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν...πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας...καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν.* It is plain that what is meant here by *πλήρωμα* is the perfectly full and complete supply of grace and of truth possessed by Christ—the divine fulness of spiritual gifts and of spiritual truth which resided in Him.

2. Meyer holds that the word is used in the same sense in Col. i. 19, *Ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι.* "What is meant is the whole charismatic riches of God, His whole gracious fulness of *εὐλογία πνευματική* of which Christ became permanent possessor and bearer, who was capable thereby of fulfilling the divine work of reconciliation."

3. In Col. ii. 9 (if not in Col. i. 19) we pass from charismatic fulness to the fulness of the divine essence. *Ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς.* "The *πλήρωμα* is here meant metaphysically of the *divina essentia*, but in the former passage charismatically of the *divina gratia*." (Meyer.)

4. In Eph. iii. 19 we have *ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and in Eph. iv. 13 *εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* In both these passages the word means completeness or perfection.

5. Apart from the verse before us, the above four form an exhaustive list of the passages in the New Testament where the word *πλήρωμα* is used theologically. It will be

Digitized by Google

seen that in every case it is used in connexion with Christ or with God, and that if we were compelled to translate it everywhere by one word, putting aside "fulness," as conveying no sufficiently definite idea to the mind, we should have to choose "completeness" or "perfection." Does it stand in the same relation to God, and does it bear the same meaning here, or is it, according to the opinion of the majority of commentators and critics, a description and synonym not of Christ but of the Church?

6. There is no grammatical objection to either application. If the words ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ are used parenthetically, πλήρωμα refers back to αὐτόν, if not, it is in apposition with τὸ σῶμα. There is nothing whatever in the passage, taken alone, to shew whether St Paul was using the clause parenthetically or not.

7. There is no theological impossibility in regarding πλήρωμα as a synonym or description of the Church. If individual Christians can receive of the πλήρωμα (John i. 16), and if they can be πεπληρωμένοι by being in Him who is the πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος (Col. ii. 10), there is no impossibility in the collective body, the Church, being called the πλήρωμα of Christ, as being filled by Him with the graces of which He was full. (That the Church could be called the πλήρωμα as being the complement of Christ the Head—the view held by most of the older commentators and revived by Dr Barry—is theologically doubtful if not inadmissible, because it implies an ἥττημα or ὑστέρημα in Christ when He is without the Church, which seems incompatible with His divine and self-sufficient nature which "filleth all things," Eph. iv. 10.)

8. But though the construction of πλήρωμα with σῶμα is neither grammatically nor theologically impossible, there are preponderating reasons for constructing it with αὐτόν.

(1) Give due weight to the fact that the word, when used as a theological term, is, in every other passage, confined in its application to the Divine Being. This raises a presumption that it is so applied here, if grammar allow it.

(2) Take into consideration and note word by word the construction of the parallel passage, Col. i. 17, 18, Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν (or αὐτός ἐστιν) πρὸ πάντων, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων· ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι. Here we have the idea (introduced in the same connexion) that Christ is the Head and the Church is the body, expressed very much as in the passage before us. The sentence in the Colossian Epistle then refers back not to the body but to Christ—ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή—and declares that in Him resides the divine πλήρωμα. Confessedly St Paul was writing these two passages in the course of the same fortnight or so. Would he have used such identical expressions as to Christ the Head and as to the body the Church in one clause, and then in the next clause have applied the remarkable and singular word πλήρωμα in one case to Christ, in the other to the Church?

(3) Take a wide view of St Paul's argument in this and the previous verses. Has he been magnifying the Church? No; he has merely spoken of it as the body of which Christ was the Head. But he is magnifying Christ: he has commemorated His Resurrection, His Session, His Universal Dominion, His Headship of the Church; and then, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, he applies to Him the sacred term πλήρωμα. Is it not the same as though he had written, in the Colossian form, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ὅς ἐστιν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου?

(4) Remember that the Gnostics of Asia Minor were already using τὸ πλήρωμα in the sense in which St Paul uses it in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that it plays a great part in their various subsequently developed systems. Does it with them ever mean the Church, or anything that with them answered to the Church? Never, but always the Divine Nature in some form or other, whether it was the Divinity into which Christ re-entered after he had performed His mission on earth (Cerinthians), or the aggregate of the Æons which emanated from the Primal Deity (Valentinians), or any modification of either theory.

9. The first of the above considerations creates a presumption in favour of πλήρωμα being in apposition with αὐτόν (Χριστόν), not with σῶμα. The second and third raise this presumption to a high and yet higher probability, and the fourth confirms its truth.

10. Objection is taken that thus God the Father is said "to give" the fulness of the Godhead to the Son, whereas He holds it of His own nature. But the Father, in virtue of the μοναρχία, does "give" to the Son that Deity which He has in common with His Father (as is explained with great clearness and precision by Hooker, 'Eccl. Pol.' v. liv. 2). And not only is the criticism founded on a theological error, but it is inapplicable to the present passage; for St Paul does not say that God gives the πλήρωμα to Christ, but that He gives to the Church, as Head of the body, Him who is the πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου.

11. The deference that we should naturally pay to the authority of the large body of commentators who regard πλήρωμα as in apposition with σῶμα ceases, when we find that all the moderns who hold that view (with the exception of Dr Barry and possibly Bishop

Digitized by Google

Wordsworth) agree in rejecting the idea of all the earlier commentators (Chrysostom, Theodore, Theodoret, Theophylact, &c.) that the Church is Christ's πλήρωμα as constituting His body and so filling up His mystical person. There is therefore no unanimity, or even essential agreement, amongst those who at first sight appear a formidable phalanx.

12. The verse may be paraphrased thus: "And He put all things under His feet and He gave Him as Head over all things to the Church, which is indeed His body—Him the fulness (*i.e.* who possesses in Himself the sum total of the properties) of the Godhead, which fills all things with everything."

---

## CHAPTER II.

1 *By comparing what we were by* 3 *nature, with what we are* 5 *by grace:* 10 *he declareth, that we are made for good works; and* 13 *being brought near by Christ, should not live as* 11 *Gentiles, and* 12 *foreigners in time past, but as* 19 *citizens with the saints, and the family of God.*

AND you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins; 2 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:

3 Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling [†]the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

† Gr. *the wills.*

---

CHAP. II. 1. *And you hath he quickened*] **You too.** St Paul returns from his digression. As the power of God had raised Christ from the dead (i. 20), so it had raised from the death of sin those who had been brought into covenant with Him by adoption in Christ. The interpolated words "hath he quickened" should be omitted. The objective case "you" is governed (with some grammatical irregularity) by the verb in verse 5. "You...us... he quickened with Christ."

*in trespasses and sins*] Perhaps, "by your trespasses and sins" (that is, offences of all sorts), but cf. Col. ii. 13. The death of sin is described in the two next verses.

2, 3 (parenthetical). THE UNREGENERATE STATE OF DEATH. Cf. Col. i. 13, 21, ii. 13, iii. 6, 7.

2. *according to the course of this world*] in accordance with the spirit and principles of the present period of existence, in which fallen man is living.

*the prince of the power of the air*] The ruler of the evil spirits, whose empire is situated in the air. It is vain to seek to discover why the air is the locality assigned to the empire of the evil spirits. Yet we may see that as spiritual beings and at the same time fallen spirits, they could not be aptly termed either terrestrial or heavenly creatures. Earth and heaven being excluded, there remains the intermediate space, the air. "Being cast down from heaven but not being yet consigned to hell, they have their empire in this lower air" (Wordsworth, who refers to Hooker, 'Eccl. Pol.' I. iv. 3). See further St Augustine, 'Enarr. in Psalm.' 143, 148; Prudentius, 'Hamartigenia,' l. 517; Milton, 'Paradise Regained,' i. 39.

*the spirit that now worketh*] This depends upon the word "prince" in the previous clause—"the prince of the empire of the air, (the director) of the spirit pervading the hearts of wicked men." This spirit "now," that is, "still," worketh in the children of disobedience, though the Ephesians had been delivered from its power by their adoption and regeneration.

*children of disobedience*] A Hebraism found in v. 6 and Col. iii. 6.

3. *we all*] St Paul (cf. Tit. iii. 3) identifies his own unconverted state with that of his converts. All were children of disobedience, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, until they received the adoption in Christ.

*of the flesh and of the mind*] **of the flesh and of the thoughts.** The impulses and wishes of the unregenerate mind have the nature of sin as much as those of the flesh, however much they may differ in respect to refinement. Pride and malice belong to the unregenerate state of death as much as sensual indulgence. Sometimes both kinds of sin are classed together as sins of the flesh (Gal. v. 19, 20).

*were by nature the children of wrath*] This is a direct statement of the doctrine of Original sin. Men are sinful (and therefore lying under God's anger) not because they have each fallen away from the natural uprightness received at birth, but by their very nature, which is faulty and corrupt since the Fall of man. For the different senses in which the word Nature may be used see Bishop Butler, 'Sermon II. on Human Nature.' From this passage is drawn the description of the unregenerate, given in the Catechism of the Church of England, as "being born in sin and the children of wrath;" from which state each child is delivered on admission into covenant with God in baptism, just as the Ephesians who had been adopted in Christ, and after believing

Digitized by Google

4 But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,

5 Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)

6 And hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus:

7 That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in *his* kindness toward us through Christ Jesus.

8 For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God:

9 Not of works, lest any man should boast.

---

were sealed (i. 13), were thereby spiritually quickened.

*as others*] **as the rest**, that is, all the rest of mankind. No exemption from the universal condition is derived by St Paul from his Judaism, or by the Ephesians from their intellectual cultivation.

**4.** *But God...quickened us*] These words refer back to ii. 1, as that verse to i. 20.

*who is rich in mercy*] **being rich in mercy.**

*for his great love*] **on account of His great love.** "Mercy delivers from misery; love bestows salvation." (Bengel.)

**5.** *hath quickened us...hath raised us*] The "hath" must in both cases be omitted; a definite act of God, which took place at the time of their adoption, is referred to. St Paul teaches that spiritual Life is in this world imparted to us on our being sealed as Christians.

*by grace ye are saved*] **by grace ye have been and are saved.** Lest there should be even a momentary doubt on this vital point, on which he had dwelt at length in all his earlier epistles, but now found it less necessary to insist, St Paul parenthetically interjects these words which he expands in *v.* 8.

**6.** *made us sit together*] The words "with Christ" must be supplied from the previous verse. As there is a spiritual resurrection on earth, anticipatory of the resurrection of body, soul and spirit hereafter, so there is a spiritual session with Christ here—a dignity and glory enjoyed by Christians through their union with Christ—anticipatory of their future session with Christ in heaven. "The inner heavenly consciousness of the faithful is to be understood, not a local raising into heaven" (Olshausen).

*in heavenly places*] the spiritual world to which the kingdom of heaven here and hereafter belongs (see note on i. 3).

*in Christ Jesus*] through our union with Him as Christians.

**7.** *in the ages to come*] This is a different expression from that used in i. 21, and means no more than, "in the times coming;" but it implies that those times would be of long duration, consisting of several periods, as St Paul had dogmatically taught the Thessalonians many years before (2 Thess. ii. 3). God exhibits the richness of His grace by His kind and gracious dealing with His Church on earth, generation after generation, as well as by glorifying it hereafter.

**8.** *For by grace are ye saved through faith*] **For by grace ye have been and are saved by faith.** St Paul here recurs to the cardinal doctrine of the Gospel that he preached, which he had paused in his argument to state parenthetically in *v.* 5—salvation by grace, brought home to each individual and realized by faith. He has been speaking of the privileges enjoyed by God's people, which if given as of desert might well engender spiritual pride, and therefore he warns them that if they have been placed in a state of salvation, it is not for their own merits, but by the will and of the free mercy of God. It was God that predestined them for adoption from all eternity (i. 4); it was Christ through whom they had redemption and forgiveness (i. 7); it was God that formed the Christian family (i. 10); it was Christ through whom they obtained the Christian inheritance (i. 11); it was the Holy Spirit by whom they were sealed as Christians after their conversion (i. 13); it was God that gave them spiritual life when they were dead (i. 19, ii. 8); it was God that gave them a spiritual resurrection and glory because they were in Christ (ii. 6); it was God that gave them salvation in such a way that they were already in possession of it (ii. 5, 8). All was of God, nothing of themselves, except faith. Faith is the instrument by which man sees, realizes, accepts, grasps the gift freely given by God. Even good works, necessary as a condition of Christian life and as a consequence of a living faith, are prepared by God for the Christian man to walk in, not performed by him as a means of obtaining future salvation or laying up merit (ii. 10).

*and that not of yourselves*] By "that" is meant the fact of their being saved. They could not have earned this: "the gift is God's." Salvation is the result of Justification, and Justification is the act, not of man, but of God, whereby He regards us as accepted for the merits not of ourselves but of Christ. The construction of the sentence, as well as the flow of the argument, is adverse to referring the clause to the word "faith," as is done by some commentators.

**9.** *lest any man should boast*] God's pur-

Digitized by Google

10 For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before [1] ordained that we should walk in them.

[1] Or, prepared.

11 Wherefore remember, that ye *being* in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;

12 That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

---

pose is to "exclude boasting" (Rom. iii. 27), "that no flesh should glory" (1 Cor. i. 29). A sense of merit is the opposite to that of humble self-renouncing dependence and consequent gratitude, which is the Christian spirit.

**10.** *For*] Salvation is not of works, *for* we are his workmanship.

*we are his workmanship*] The word (ποίημα) means the product of an artist's labour; the chair is the workmanship of the carpenter, the jar of the potter. There is here a glance at the truth enlarged upon in the Epistle to the Romans, that man is the mere creature of God, whence it follows that any good thing which emanates from man really flows from God as its author; but it is rather the *re*-creation in Christ than the original creation that is now used as a ground of argument. In the new life to which Christians are born when "after they have believed they have been sealed with the Holy Spirit" (i. 13), they are "created unto good works." Just as the lungs are made to breathe and the eye to see, so the Christian man is constituted by God's grace "unto (or for) good works." His good works do not create for him his Christian standing-ground either in this world or the next. It is no merit in the lung to breathe or in the eye to see; breathing and seeing are the virtues of the lung and of the eye, but they deserve no reward. So good works are the virtues of the Christian man without which he fails of his proper excellence; and their performance is required of him, as the performance of the task of breathing is required of the lung and seeing of the eye, but they merit nothing, and are not causes of salvation here or hereafter. To himself and to others they serve as tests by which to know whether he is in a state of salvation and is therefore likely to be in the same state hereafter; their absence (when circumstances admit of their being performed) proves that salvation is absent, but their seeming presence is not an equally trustworthy test, as men are so liable to deceive themselves as to the true character of the acts which they or others perform. Cf. Articles XI. XII. XIII. and Abp Laurence's 'Bampton Lectures,' *passim*.

*hath before ordained*] **prepared beforehand.**

11—22. REMINDER OF THE PRIVILEGES TO WHICH GENTILES HAD ATTAINED BY THE ADOPTION IN CHRIST, AND BY THE RECONCILIATION WROUGHT BY HIM BETWEEN MAN AND MAN AND BETWEEN MAN AND GOD. Cf. Col. i. 12, 13, 20, 21; ii. 14, 20.

**11.** *Wherefore*] Seeing that this is so.

*remember*] He seeks to instil humility and thankfulness by reminding them of what they had been and what they had become: they had been aliens and Gentiles, but had now become God's own people. The majority of the Asiatic Christians, if not of the Ephesian converts, would have been Gentiles. See Introduction, § 3, 2.

*in the flesh*] These words, applied to the Gentiles, are not put in contrast with the same words applied to the circumcision at the end of the verse, nor do they refer to the token of circumcision being in the flesh, but they mean "by physical descent," or, as we say, "by blood."

*Uncircumcision*] A word of reproach and contempt in the mouth of the Jews (1 S. xvii. 26, xxxi. 4, 2 S. i. 20), erected by them into a proper name.

*by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands*] A compressed sentence for "by those who are called the Circumcision, whose circumcision however is only in the flesh, made by hands." Cf. Rom. ii. 28, 29, "Neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh...circumcision is that of the heart."

**12.** *without Christ*] St Paul enumerates the losses of the Gentiles as compared with the Jews. They were without the expectation of Messiah, they did not belong to God's people, they were not in covenant with God, they had no hope of the life to come, and no real grasp of God to support them in their trials in this life.

*the covenants of promise*] the various covenants of God with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses—all of which contained explicitly or by implication the promise of the Messiah and of the Inheritance. Cf. Wisd. xviii. 22; 2 Macc. viii. 15.

*in the world*] The heathen are represented as living outside of the sacred kingdom, in the

Digitized by Google

13 But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

14 For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us*;

15 Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, *so* making peace;

16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity[1] thereby:

[1] Or, *in himself.*

---

wicked and weary world (kosmos); and as though that were not enough, even there having no full assurance of God's providence. "Being Christless, they are described in regular gradation as being churchless, hopeless, godless, and homeless" (Eadie).

**13.** *But now in Christ Jesus*] "now that you are Christians," a contrast to their previous estate, brought about by union with Christ Jesus. The latter name is added to shew that they had more than the Jewish expectation of an indefinite Messiah: they knew that Messiah was Jesus, and that they were His.

*far off*] Cf. Acts ii. 39, "The promise is to you and to your children and all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

*are made nigh*] **were made nigh.**

*by the blood of Christ*] A result of Christ's death was the abolition of Jewish exclusiveness and monopoly.

14—18 (parenthetical). THE BLESSED WORK OF CHRIST IN MAKING PEACE BETWEEN JEW AND GENTILE, AND BETWEEN MAN AND GOD, AND PUBLISHING THE GOSPEL OF PEACE. Cf. Col. i. 22, ii. 14, 20.

**14.** *our...both...us*] Jew and Gentile.

*hath made...hath broken*] **made...broke.**

*the middle wall of partition*] that which separated Jew and Gentile as much as if it were a wall running between them and fencing off one from the other. It has been thought that half unconsciously St Paul may have had the expression suggested to him by the partition wall in the Court of the Temple, on which was fixed the tablet forbidding Gentiles to advance further on pain of death, which is described by Josephus ('Antiq.' XV. 11. 5; 'Bell. Jud.' V. 5. 2), and has been lately discovered under the ruins of the Temple (see 'Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund' for August, 1871).

**15.** *Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances*] The construction and meaning are as follows: "Who made both (Jew and Gentile) one, and broke down the middle wall of partition, that is, the mutual hatred existing between them, and abolished by his flesh (that is, by his life and death on earth) the law of commandments in ordinances (that is, the ceremonial law of positive precepts)." The Greek commentators understand the words rendered in the A.V. by "contained in ordinances" (ἐν δόγμασι, lit. "in, or by dogmas") as not referring to the ordinances of Moses but to the precepts of the Gospel, and translate "abolished the Mosaic commandments by his teaching." Similarly, Bengel, referring to Acts xvi. 4, renders "abolished (or swallowed up) the law of commandments proper to the Israelites in the universal ordinances of grace." Modern critics too peremptorily deny that the Greek words will bear this meaning. A dogma may be a Mosaic rule (Joseph. 'Ant.' XV. 5. 3), or an Imperial order (Luke ii. 1), or an Apostolic ordinance (Acts xvi. 4), or a Christian precept (Ignat. 'Epist. ad Magn.' XIII)—any command in short which rests for its sanction on authority, whatever that authority may be. It is not the use of the word "dogma" so much as the context, which here and in the parallel passage of the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 14) points to the Mosaic ordinances, and to the rendering of the A.V. rather than to that of S. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact.

*of twain*] **of the twain.**

*one new man*] The Jewish and the Gentile elements of the human race are fused into one new substance or being, transformed in character (καινός) as well as beginning afresh (νέος), Col. iii. 10.

*making peace*] between the two.

**16.** *And that he might reconcile both unto God*] This is the second part of Christ's work as Peacemaker. First He unites Jew and Gentile, and then He reconciles both, that is, all mankind, to God.

*in one body*] the one body formed by the combination of Jew and Gentile. Cf. Col. iii. 15; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 13. The words have no reference to the person of Christ, though the parallel passage of Col. i. 22 is in favour of such a reference, which Bengel and others advocate.

*by the cross*] As it is the cross which is the instrument by which mankind is reconciled to God, it must be by propitiation and expiation that the reconciliation is effected. This shews that God had to be reconciled to man as well as man to God, as has been already implied in the expression "children of wrath" in ii. 3.

*having slain the enmity thereby*] that is, after

Digitized by Google

17 And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.

18 For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

19 Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;

20 And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner *stone*;

21 In whom all the building fitly

---

having first put an end to the enmity between Jew and Gentile thereby, *i.e.* by the Cross. Cf. Col. ii. 15.

**17.** *And came and preached peace*] Rather, "And he came and published the good tidings of peace." He not only effected peace between Jew and Gentile and between man and God, but He also came and brought the good news of the peace having been made. He "came" for this purpose in His own person, and by His Apostles whom He commissioned.

*to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh*] to you Gentiles and to the Jews. The better MSS. insert the word "peace" a second time—**peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh.** The words are quoted from Isai. lvii. 19.

**18.** *For*] **Namely that.** This was the Gospel of Peace that he delivered—that through Him and by the indwelling Spirit all mankind (not only Jews) are brought nigh to the Father. So in Gal. iv. 5 the object of the redemption is declared to be "that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Cf. Rom. viii. 15. The three Persons of the Holy Trinity are indicated in this verse as in *vv.* 19, 20, 22.

**19.** *Now therefore*] He returns to *v.* 13, where the argument had been partially interrupted by his enlargement on the theme of Christ the Peacemaker.

*strangers and foreigners*] **strangers and sojourners.** The two words are used in conjunction in Lev. xxv. 23. In Lev. xxii. 10 the latter word is used in the sense of a lodger, "a sojourner of the priest, or a hired servant, shall not eat of the holy thing." It designates the man who has not the privileges of the household, as "stranger" designated those who had not the rights of citizenship.

*but fellow-citizens with the saints*] "but **ye are** fellow-citizens." The words "ye are" rest on the authority of the best MSS. The saints with whom they are made to share citizenship are those belonging to the body formed by Jews and Gentiles now united in Christ, who are successors of the saints of the old dispensation in having become God's people.

*of the household of God*] and so contrasted with the "sojourners" or lodgers, as they are contrasted with "strangers" in their quality of "citizens." See note on Gal. vi. 10.

**20.** *And are built*] The use of the word "household" suggests the metaphor of a house.

*upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets*] upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, on which, after it had been laid, they were themselves built as lively stones, and they by their ministry built others. It was the work of the Apostles and the other teachers of the Apostolic days to lay, by preaching Christ, the foundation on which the Church of the future was to be built up (Rom. xv. 20).

*apostles and prophets*] The position of the "prophets" after instead of before the apostles, and the use of the phrase in iii. 5, iv. 11, make it more than probable that the prophets here meant are those of the New Testament, whose office it was by the exposition of Divine truth to "edify the body of Christ." (But see Bp. Wordsworth's argument on the other side in his note *ad loc.*) The importance of the position held by the prophets in the Apostolic Church is brought out in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, chs. xii., xiii., xiv. See below, iv. 11.

*the chief corner stone*] A solid stone of double size lying at the angle where the two chief walls of a building meet, and on which they both rest. This stone represents Christ, both as the foundation stone on which the Church rests, and as the binding power which held together the two elements of Jew and Gentile. See Isai. xxviii. 16. A similar but not identical metaphor is used in Ps. cxviii. 22, quoted in several places of the New Testament. There He is described as the Head of the corner, that is, the most projecting or prominent stone in the corner. See Matt. xxi. 42; Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 7.

*himself*] This word may be rendered "of it"—"Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone of it," and this translation is adopted by Bengel and Holzhausen, but the A. V. rendering is to be preferred.

**21.** *In whom*] that is in Christ, on whom the building rests and in whom it is framed together. It is a mistake to render "on which" with Theophylact, Luther, Beza.

*all the building*] The absence of the Greek article from the majority of the MSS. has induced Wickliffe and Tyndale to translate

Digitized by Google

framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:

22 In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

## CHAPTER III.

*5 The hidden mystery, 6 that the Gentiles should be saved, 3 was made known to Paul by revelation: 8 and to him was that grace given, that 9 he should preach it. 13 He desireth them not to faint for his tribulation, 14 and prayeth 19 that they may perceive the great love of Christ toward them.*

FOR this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,

2 If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward:

---

"each building," "every building;" and several commentators, including even Meyer, consider that it is necessary so to translate: but in Hellenistic Greek the article is not in all cases required. See Luke iv. 13; Acts ii. 36, vii. 22; Eph. iii. 15 (where see note); Joseph. 'Antiq.' IV. 5. 1. Nay its absence is not unknown in both early and later classical Greek. See Hom. 'Il.' XXIV. 107; Hes. 'Op. et Dies,' 510; Thucyd. II. 43; and Bp Jacobson's note to Ignatius' 'Epist. ad Ephes.' c. XII.

*fitly framed together*] each stone fitting into that next to it, for the strength and for the comeliness of the building—a description of the ideal Church: the actual Church may be "rent at the top asunder" and yet remain Christ's Church, provided that "it continues built upon the main foundation" at the bottom (Hooker 'Eccl. Pol.' v. 68. 6).

*groweth*] constantly rising in height by the continual addition of layers of new stones. The stones are men, laid one after the other, as generation passes after generation, on the foundation once for all established by the Apostles. The idea of growth of doctrine is alien from the passage. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5.

*an holy temple in the Lord*] a holy Christian temple. The Church is declared to be the temple of God in 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16, and it is called Christ's house in Heb. iii. 6. St Paul's Ephesian readers would naturally contrast the spiritual Christian temple here portrayed with the material heathen temple which was so familiar a sight to them, but it is not likely that St Paul, here or elsewhere, refers or alludes to the famous temple of Artemis.

**22.** *In whom*] Possibly "in which," sc. the temple.

*ye also are builded together*] Ye that were Gentiles (ii. 11) and strangers (ii. 19) and dead in trespasses and sins (ii. 1) are now built in as living stones with the others.

*an habitation of God through the Spirit*] "where God dwells by His Spirit." The Church is the abode of the Spirit, as the heart of each believer is (2 Cor. vi. 16). In both cases the habitation is often defiled, and the indwelling Spirit is grieved and provoked to depart, but He abides there still, as long as the temple continues to be the Lord's, or the man has not ceased to belong to Christ.

CHAP. III. 1. COMMENCEMENT OF PRAYER, COMPLETED IN *vv.* 14—21.

**1.** *For this cause*] St Paul having finished his portraiture of the Church, consisting of Jew and Gentile, founded upon Christ, built up harmoniously on Him, and constituting the habitation of the indwelling Holy Ghost, offers a prayer that his converts may rise to a full apprehension of the blessed privileges of which they have been made partakers. Accordingly he begins, "For this cause I Paul"—but having got so far, he enters on a digression (which though introduced in the form of a digression bears immediately on the main object of the Epistle) relating to himself and his office, which lasts for thirteen verses, at the conclusion of which he resumes (*v.* 14) with the same words, "For this cause I"—and completes the sentence with "bow my knees unto the Father...that he would grant you."

*the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles*] For the common term, "the Apostle of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles," he substitutes the word "prisoner," descriptive of his present estate in Rome.

2—13. SOLEMN AFFIRMATION BY ST PAUL THAT HIS INSIGHT INTO THE MYSTERY OF THE GENTILE ADOPTION WAS DIVINELY GIVEN, AND THAT HE HAD BEEN APPOINTED BY GOD TO HIS OFFICE AS APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES AND ENLIGHTENER IN THIS MYSTERY. Cf. Col. i. 23—29.

**2.** *If ye have heard*] This phrase does not express doubt. Rather it expresses, in a gentle form, an assurance on St Paul's part that they *had* heard—"if ye heard, as indeed ye did hear" (cf. Col. i. 23). It would, however, have been more natural for St Paul to have written, "since ye *know*" (rather than "heard of"), if the Epistle had been addressed *solely* to that Church to which he had personally "declared the whole counsel of God," and whose Presbyters had "fallen upon his neck and kissed him" as their Father in God (Acts xx. 37). See Introduction, § 3, 2.

*the dispensation of the grace of God*] the divine dispensation whereby the grace of God was freely bestowed on St Paul for the benefit of the Gentiles.

Digitized by Google

3 How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote [1] afore in few words,

[1] Or, a little before.

4 Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ)

5 Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit;

6 That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel:

---

**3.** *How that by revelation he made known unto me*] **Namely that by revelation there was made known unto me**, on the authority of the best MSS.

*by revelation*] See Gal. i. 16; Acts xxii. 21; 2 Cor. xii. 1.

*the mystery*] the adoption of the Gentiles, as explained in *v.* 6.

*as I wrote afore in few words*] *i.e.* "as I have shortly written above," viz. in i. 9 and also in ii. 11—13.

**4.** *Whereby*] **In regard to which**, that is, the previous passage referred to by him.

*when ye read*] The Epistles were to be read aloud in the Churches (see Col. iv. 16). If St Paul had been addressing the Ephesians alone, it is unlikely that he would have appealed to a previous passage in this Epistle rather than to their personal knowledge of him for proof of his insight into the mystery of the adoption of the Gentiles into the covenant.

*ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ*] **ye can perceive my intelligence of the mystery of Christ**; from whence they might infer that he was directly enlightened upon it by Christ having revealed it to him (*v.* 3). It is called "the mystery of Christ" because the subject of the mystery was the Gentile adoption in Christ. Cf. Col. i. 27.

**5.** *in other ages*] Meyer translates "to other generations"—unnecessarily.

*sons of men*] contrasted with the apostles and prophets of the next clause. Men, as such, were ignorant: it was revealed to some of them who were apostles and prophets. St Paul does not say that previous generations of mankind had no knowledge of the mystery, but that they had no such knowledge as had been given to the apostles and prophets by direct revelation of the Spirit. Some knowledge on the subject was granted to the Jewish prophets of old. See Rom. ix. 25; Acts xv. 17.

*unto his holy apostles and prophets*] the prophets of the New Testament. See ii. 20. This is the only passage in Scripture where the now familiar conjunction of words "holy apostles" is found. The epithet here emphasizes the distinction between the apostles and prophets on the one hand, to whom the mystery was revealed, and the sons of men on the other, who were kept in comparative darkness about it. If all Christians were holy (the word "saints" is in the original the same as "holy"), *à fortiori* the apostles.

**6.** *That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise*] "That the Gentiles **are** fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of **the** promise." The A. V. loses a point of similarity in the three Gentile privileges by not expressing the force of the Greek compounds by the same English word, lit. "heirs together, incorporated together, sharers together." They are not heirs after the Jews, but together with them; not attached to the Hebrew body, but incorporated into it together with the element that previously constituted it; not receivers of the promise after others had been satisfied, but partakers of it together with them.

*fellow-heirs*] At St Paul's conversion he was commissioned to go to the Gentiles, "that they might receive forgiveness of sins *and inheritance* among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Acts xxvi. 18). See also Col. i. 12. This inheritance, the spiritual counterpart of the earthly Canaan, is in its ultimate analysis the possession and enjoyment of the Spirit of God, the earnest of which is given to His people here as a pledge of full fruition hereafter. See note on i. 18.

*partakers of his promise*] "of **the** promise." The three assurances made to Abraham in Gen. xvii. 4—8, (1) that he should be the father of many nations, (2) that the covenant between God and his seed should be of perpetual duration, (3) that his seed should inherit Canaan and hold it as an everlasting possession, seem to have gone under the name of "the promise." The promise, hitherto confined to Abraham's children in the flesh, was now extended, in its spiritual signification, to those who, being adopted in Christ, (1) had become his spiritual children, (2) were admitted into the new covenant with God, (3) had obtained the promised inheritance. See i. 11, 13, 14, 18.

*in Christ*] **in Christ Jesus**, *i.e.* as Christians.

*by the gospel*] The preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles was the instrumental cause of their obtaining those privileges which the Jews claimed exclusively for themselves.

Digitized by Google

7 Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power.

8 Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;

9 And to make all *men* see what *is* the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:

10 To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly *places* might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God,

---

7. *given unto me*] There is almost equal authority for making these words agree with "gift" or with "grace;" the sense is the same in either case.

*by the effectual working of his power*] These words should be joined with "I was made a minister," a comma being inserted after "given unto me." St Paul attributes to the working of God not only the call and appointment to his office, which were made once for all, but also the daily acts of his ministry. Cf. Col. i. 29, "I labour, striving according to his working which worketh in me mightily."

8. *Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints*] The thought of his personal unworthiness is constantly connected in St Paul's mind with that of his ministry, and calls up a feeling of self-abasement and humility which seeks out unusual and anomalous forms of words (the word here used is a comparative formed from a superlative, as though we should say "leaster than all Christians") to express itself. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 13.

*is this grace given*] **was this grace given.**

*that I should preach*] Rather, "to preach." If the form "that I should preach" be used here, it must also be used in the next verse, "and that I should make."

*among the Gentiles*] Or, "to the Gentiles," according to the reading of Codices ℵ, A, B, C.

*the unsearchable riches*] See Rom. xi. 33.

9. *all*] not only Gentiles but all. His apostolate was in a special way to the Gentiles, but by his teaching he enlightened Jew and Gentile alike as to God's plan of adopting the latter and placing them upon an equality with the former; nay more, he gave an insight into God's counsels even to angelic intelligences, as explained in *v.* 10. The word "men" introduced in the A. V. should be omitted.

*what is the fellowship of the mystery*] **what is the dispensation of the mystery.** This change has to be made in deference to the authority of the MSS. and accords with the sense required by the context.

*from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God*] "**from the beginning of the ages** hath been hid in God." The periods or ages began when time commenced, and ran on to the date of St Paul's commission, during which ages God's purpose that His Church should be Catholic instead of local, all-embracing instead of being confined to one nation, was unknown to man, lying hidden in the bosom of God.

*who created all things by Jesus Christ*] The words "by Jesus Christ" must be omitted, not being found in the best MSS., the early versions, or the Latin Fathers. God is designated by His title of Creator, because the ages just mentioned began at the Creation, when Time first took its existence.

10. *To the intent that*] The mystery has been hidden from the beginning of time, but is now revealed by the instrumentality of St Paul, in order that God's wisdom may be made manifest. The manifestation of God's wisdom is not only a result of the revelation (as Estius and Thomas Aquinas explain it), but a purpose of it, though not the only or the chief purpose.

*unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places*] A purpose of the revelation of the long hidden mystery being the manifestation of God's wisdom, to whom is this manifestation made? (1) To the Gentiles, to whom the gift of adoption was granted (*v.* 8); (2) to the Jews, who were now first enlightened upon a point to which their eyes had hitherto been blinded (*v.* 9); (3) to angelic beings, whose intelligence had not been able to pierce through the darkness that shrouded God's plan, whereby the privileges of His covenant had been confined to but one nation of the earth from the days of Abraham to the time of Christ, but who were now able to justify His ways on seeing the abolition of the once necessary restriction. As to the partial knowledge of the angels see 1 Pet. i. 12.

*might be known*] **might be made known** or manifested.

*by the church*] by the constitution of the Church being so altered as to admit all nations to its bosom as fellow-heirs, of the same body, and partakers of the promise.

*the manifold wisdom*] **the multiform wisdom.** It was wisdom, which down to the time of Abraham required no special covenant between man and God; wisdom, which for two thousand years made His covenant the possession of a single people; wisdom, which

Digitized by Google

11 According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord:

12 In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.

13 Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

14 For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

15 Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,

---

then offered admission to it to all the nations of the earth—but it was a multiform wisdom, which "at sundry times" acted "in divers manners," and when regarded in its several parts instead of as a whole, bore the appearance of unwisdom to spectators, and was incomprehensible even to angels. See note on Heb. i. 1.

**11.** *According to the eternal purpose*] Lit. the purpose of the ages. These words must be connected with the verb "might be made known." St Paul hastens to say that the manifestation of God's wisdom, now made through himself, was no result of accident or of circumstances, but was purposed by God from the beginning of the ages.

*which he purposed*] **which He fulfilled**, lit. "which He did." The purpose existed when the universe was created and time began, and it was fulfilled in and by Christ on His coming on earth.

**12.** *In whom*] Without Christ the Mediator man feels himself estranged from God and hides himself from Him. Through Christ and by faith realizing our unity with Him, we have boldness of access, with which, requiring no other intercessor, we approach God as our Father in the confidence of children. This is the *moral* result of the adoption in Christ; it casts out the spirit of fear which seeks about for intercessors, and substitutes that of childlike confidence and love.

*by the faith of him*] That is, by the faith which we have in Him. Faith begets confidence, and confidence begets boldness in which we approach Him.

**13.** *Wherefore*] Seeing that I have been the means of bringing you into this state of sonship, which ought to be a matter of glory both to you and to me.

*I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you*] These words, which are rightly translated (Theodoret, Jerome, Bengel, Harless, Olshausen render, "I pray that I may not faint"), seem to imply a consciousness on St Paul's part of a certain tenderness allied to faintheartedness in those whom he addresses, which appears also in the account given of the Ephesian Presbyters in Acts xx. 37, when "they all wept sore, and fell on Paul's neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more."

14—21. Resumption and continuation of Prayer that forming as they do one family—that of God the Father—they may be strengthened by the Holy Spirit and by the indwelling of Christ. Cf. Col. i. 9—11.

**14.** *For this cause*] St Paul resumes with the same words with which he had broken off in *v.* 1, all that intervenes being, in form, parenthetical. The occasion of his prayer is the fact of the Ephesians being built up with the other Christians into the spiritual temple depicted in ch. ii.

*unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*] The words "of our Lord Jesus Christ" must be omitted. St Jerome says, "We must read simply 'to the Father,' not 'to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,' which is an addition of the Latin Codices."

**15.** *Of whom*] *i.e.* the Father.

*the whole family in heaven and earth*] Lit. "every family in heaven and on earth," but in spite of the absence of the Greek article the first words may be correctly translated "the whole family" (see note on ii. 21), and there is a special force and signification in the expression here which makes such a translation necessary. The word rendered "family" is found in Luke i. 27, "of *the house* of David," where it means all that are derived from a common progenitor, and so belong to a common stock. It is used in the same sense in the present passage. St Paul has been unfolding the mystery that Jew and Gentile are made one in Christ, are incorporated into one body, are spiritually descended from one ancestor, and have become joint heirs of the latter and recipients in common of the promises made to his descendants; they are now one "house," one "family," the Father's "house," the Father's "family," deriving even its name of "family" (πατριά) from Him the Father (πατήρ); but this wide-spreading family contains more than the hitherto warring sections of mankind; it embraces angelic beings also in its wide sweep, as indicated in i. 10. Thus God gives the name of "family"—a name derived from His own name of Father—to angels and men united in Christ Jesus. To the Father St Paul addresses his prayer for the newly admitted members of the family, that they may be strengthened by the Spirit and by Christ indwelling in them.

Digitized by Google

16 That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man;

17 That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love,

18 May be able to comprehend with all saints what *is* the breadth, and length, and depth, and height;

19 And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.

---

**16.** *in the inner man*] **unto the inward man.** This expression is used three times in the New Testament. In Rom. vii. 22 it means the spiritualized conscience which condemns the impulses of sensuality. In 2 Cor. iv. 16 it means the religious as opposed to the physical life. Here it means the spiritual life into which St Paul prays that the Ephesians may grow by the power of God's Spirit. In the parallel passage of the Epistle to the Colossians, after praying in like manner "that they might be strengthened with all might according to his glorious power," he substitutes for "unto the inward man," "unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness," thus shewing what especial qualities he contemplated when using the general phrase "the inward man" (see Col. i. 11). A similar expression, "the hidden man of the heart," is found in 1 Pet. iii. 4, signifying the interior spiritual life which exhibits itself in "a meek and quiet spirit," a frame of mind not differing greatly from "patience and long-suffering with joyfulness." The more commonly used phrase, "the new man," designates the regenerate life.

**17.** *That*] The clause "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith" is a separate and second petition, depending upon "that he would grant you" in *v.* 16. Cf. John xiv. 23, "And we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." The heart of the Christian and the Church at large are both the Divine dwelling-place. There is a glance backwards to ii. 22.

*by faith*] Faith is a condition without which neither the spiritual life nor the indwelling of Christ can exist, for He can do no mighty works where He is met by unbelief (Mark vi. 5). Faith does not merely apprehend the divine working in the soul, but it brings the Divine Worker into it.

*that ye, being rooted and grounded in love*] **being rooted and grounded in love; that ye may.** There is no authority for transposing the conjunction as is done in the A. V. It is true that the participles are in the nominative case, but this anomalous construction is not very unusual. The words must be closely connected with those that precede them in sense as well as grammar. Whosoever is made strong by God's Spirit must necessarily be rooted and grounded in love, for love is another name for the ordinary working of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man, and where God's Spirit is, there is love.

**18.** *May be able*] This is the prayer to which the two previous petitions have led up, and it is in close connexion with the subject of the Epistle. St Paul has been expounding the redeeming and reconciling work of Christ, whereby the blessings of the covenant had been extended to the Gentiles. In Him they had been adopted (i. 5), in Him they had been redeemed (i. 7), in Him they had been forgiven (*ib.*), in Him they had obtained the inheritance (i. 11), in Him they had been sealed (i. 13), in Him they had been raised up and enthroned (ii. 6), in Him they had been saved (ii. 8), in Him they were created unto good works (ii. 10), in Him they that were afar off had been made nigh (ii. 13), in Him peace was made between man and man (ii. 15), in Him reconciliation was effected between man and God (ii. 16), in Him access was opened to the Father by the Spirit (ii. 18), in Him they were built together into a holy temple for an habitation of God by the Spirit (ii. 22): "for this cause" therefore (iii. 1, 14) he prays God that they may be so strengthened by the Spirit (iii. 16) and filled with Christ's indwelling presence (iii. 17) that they may be able (lit. "quite able") to comprehend the breadth and length and depth and height of the love of Christ in shedding His blood (i. 7, 13) and enduring the cross (ii. 16), to effect these so great benefits; and comprehending this, may be filled with all the fulness of God.

*with all saints*] He prays that knowledge may be not only enjoyed by the Ephesians, but shared with them by all the members of the Church who are united under the headship of Christ (i. 10).

*the breadth, and length, and depth, and height*] That is, "of the love of Christ," omitted here because expressed (with a slightly different construction) in the next clause. Of the many other suggestions that have been made as to the subject of "St Paul's mensuration," none are worth mentioning except (1) that of Bengel, who refers it to "the fulness of God;" (2) that of Dean Alford and Dr Barry, who suggest that, if anything is to be supplied, it should be "of the mystery."

**19.** *And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge*] One of St Paul's paradoxes. Cf. 1 Tim. v. 6, "She is dead while she liveth." These paradoxes are not, even

Digitized by Google

20 Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us,

21 Unto him *be* glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *He exhorteth to unity,* 7 *and declareth that God therefore giveth divers* 11 *gifts unto men, that his church might be* 13 *edified, and* 16 *grown up in Christ.* 18 *He calleth them from the impurity of the Gentiles,* 24 *to put on the new man,* 25 *to cast off lying, and* 29 *corrupt communication.*

I THEREFORE, the prisoner [1] of the Lord, beseech you that ye

[1] Or, *in the Lord.*

---

literally taken, untrue. All the love of Christ—what He did for love's sake and why He did it—passes human understanding, but we may know something of it, and shall know more and more according as we are more strengthened by His Spirit, and enlightened by faith, rooted and grounded in love.

*that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God*] **unto all the fulness of God.** This is the climax of the prayer, as it might be of every intercessory prayer, that they might be filled with grace so as to approach more and more towards (unto) the perfection with which God alone is full. Olshausen renders, "that ye may be filled with all Christian gifts and virtues unto the complete fulness of God, *i.e.* that ye may be so filled as God is filled." With these words St Paul ends his prayer, which is followed by a doxology.

**20.** *according to the power that worketh in us*] We know something of the power of God which works within us, and arguing from what we do know to that which we do not know, we gather some idea of His Omnipotence, which is able to do for man more than man is able to ask or to imagine.

**21.** *be glory in the church by Christ Jesus*] **in the Church and in Christ Jesus.** In that Church whose splendours have been now first brought to light by the admission of Gentiles within its bounds. He adds, "and in Christ Jesus," for no glory can be derived to God from the Church, except it be a glory coming immediately from Christ the Head, or mediately from Him through His members, in so far as they are in Him. (The conjunction "and" is found in all the oldest MSS.)

*throughout all ages, world without end*] Lit. "unto all the generations of the age of the ages." This expression does not denote eternity in the philosophic sense of an ever-abiding now, but it does denote what to us is the same thing, everlasting duration. "The ages" are the various periods, which commencing when time commenced, have run their course and been succeeded, and will be succeeded, by other periods as long as human consciousness (of which time is a condition) shall exist in its present estate. The period comprising all these periods is "the age of the ages." The expression is borrowed from the LXX. version of Dan. vii. 18. Slightly altered in form it occurs in Gal. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 23; Heb. vi. 20. A "generation," also a LXX. phrase, signifies a division of time equal in length to the duration of the life of man. Glory is to go up to God in the Church through all subdivisions of that age which is the sum of all the ages. The formula "world without end" has grown so familiar to us that it seems hopeless to change it, but it is inexact and very misleading (as will be seen by an attempt to translate it into a foreign language). If it were possible, it would be better to substitute for the words in the text, **through the duration of all time.**

CHAP. IV. 1—16. EXHORTATION TO UNITY IN THAT CHURCH IN WHICH GENTILE AND JEW ARE EQUALLY CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS, WITH THE SAME DOCTRINES, THE SAME RITES, AND THE SAME MINISTRY. Cf. Col. i. 10, ii. 19, iii. 12, 14.

**1.** *therefore*] St Paul has expounded the mystery of the Gentile adoption in Christ (i., ii.), which had been revealed to him and which he had made known to the Ephesians (iii. 1—13). He has followed up his exposition with a prayer that they may realize the love of Christ which had wrought so great things for them (iii. 14—21); and in close connexion with what has preceded he now adds an exhortation to mutual forbearance and love among those who have been made equal members of the one body of Christ. He is pursuing the same theme which has occupied him throughout the Epistle, not taking up a new question after finishing his main subject, nor, on the other hand, beginning now his main subject, to which the previous chapters have been subsidiary.

*the prisoner of the Lord*] **in the Lord.** A form of expression essentially the same as that employed in iii. 1 is used in order to mark that the exhortation of iv. is a consequence on the dogmatic teaching of i., ii. as much as the prayer of iii. The idea that St Paul uses the term "prisoner" as triumphing in his chains (Meyer) is foreign to

Digitized by Google

walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,

2 With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love;

3 Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

4 *There is* one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;

5 One Lord, one faith, one baptism,

6 One God and Father of all, who *is* above all, and through all, and in you all.

---

the occasion. It means rather "the prisoner —and a prisoner because I am a Christian."

*the vocation wherewith ye are called*] **wherewith ye were called.** God had predestined the adoption of the Gentile nations in Christ before the foundation of the world (i. 4); He had called them by the instrumentality of St Paul's preaching (i. 13—ii. 8) when the time came at which it was His will that they should be invited within the precincts of the Church.

**2.** *forbearing one another*] The jealousy between Jewish and Gentile converts to Christianity was the greatest cause of strife and heartburning in the early Church. The Apostle addresses both. If it were the Gentiles, who for the first time had been called into the kingdom of God, it was the first time too that the Jews had been called into the kingdom of Christ. Both had received a common blessing, and each was bound to be forbearing towards the other. The Jew must not look down upon the Gentile who had so long been an alien, the Gentile must not retort upon the Jew who had slain the Lord of glory; and to prevent this party-bickering and quarrelling, they must both alike be "lowly," that is, holding a humble estimate of themselves as sinful men; "meek," that is, giving no offence to others and unresentful on provocation; "long-suffering," that is, patient and self-possessed under injustice.

*in love*] Christian forbearance is not to have for its motive the moral superiority felt by the man who does not yield to the temptation of a sharp or angry retort, but kindly feeling and regard for the other person, on account of his being a member of the same body, and that body, Christ's. (Lachmann is wrong in uniting the words with the clause following.)

**3.** *to keep the unity of the Spirit*] The Spirit dwelling within the Church (ii. 22) creates a oneness of feeling among all true members of the Church, because He animates each and all of them and is Himself one. St Paul desires them earnestly to endeavour not to mar this unity by internal strife, its bond of preservation being "peace." "The peace here spoken of differs not much from the virtue of meekness: only it adds, above meekness towards others, quietness with them" (Laud, 'Sermon' VI., preached on this text before Parliament, 1628). The three following verses contain reasons why they should be at one together, sharing as they did in one body and one Spirit, and having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God.

**4.** *There is*] No verb is expressed in the original. This is not unusual when the saying is a sort of watchword. Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Heb. xiii. 4.

*one body*] The mystical body of Christ, the Christian Church; but one, though consisting of such diverse elements. There is a reference to ii. 16 "that he might reconcile both unto God in one body."

*one Spirit*] The indwelling Spirit (see Laud, as above) animating the whole body and each member of it without respect of persons. There is a reference to ii. 18, 22. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 13, "for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles."

*as ye are called in one hope of your calling*] **as ye were called.** When they received their calling, they all alike, whatever was their nationality, were called unto one and the same hope of Eternal life. The preposition "in" is joined with "called" in three other passages in St Paul's Epistles, where it is translated in the A.V. by "unto" or "into." 1 Cor. vii. 15; Gal. i. 6; 1 Thess. iv. 7.

**5.** *One Lord*] The Lord and Head of the Church, in whom all things are gathered together in one (i. 10).

*one faith*] The faith that realized the adoption in Christ, which was the same in Jew and Gentile.

*one baptism*] The same rite with the same formula admitted each and all into the Church, being the seal of the faith possessed in common by all.

**6.** *One God*] Not Jehovah for the Jews, and other gods for the various Gentile nations, but one God for all, who is "Father of all," whatever their race or ancestry. He had been the Father even when men were alienated from Him; much more now that they are reconciled and brought into His house.

*who is above all*] The supreme King of one section as much as of the other.

*and through all, and in you all*] The "you" must be omitted, not being found in the old MSS. St Paul having spoken of God as "above" them all, adds the two further prepositions "through" and "in" lest he should



Digitized by Google

7 But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.

8 Wherefore he saith, [a]When he ascended up on high, he led [1]captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

[a] Psal. 68. 18.
[1] Or, a multitude of captives.

seem to be depicting some far-off Epicurean God. He is "above," but He is "through" and "in" also. He is their heavenly King, but He is also close to them, pervading them all alike, dwelling in them all alike.

It is clear that it is no mystical Church of which St Paul is here detailing the salient points of unity, but the Church made up of all the Jewish residents and native Ephesians who had been converted to Christianity; and accordingly it is from this passage that theologians have for the most part gathered the Notes of Unity of the Visible Church. Bishop Pearson enumerates: (1) the unity of the Head; (2) of the Spirit; (3) of origin; (4) of faith; (5) of sacraments; (6) of hope; (7) of charity; (8) of discipline ('Expos. of the Creed,' Art. IX.). Cf. Hooker III. 1; V. 68; and Laud's 'Sermon' above referred to.

7. *But unto every one of us*] **But unto each of us.** St Paul has not yet finished enumerating the common possessions of those who once had been at enmity, but now form the united body of Christians. They have one and the same body, one and the same Spirit, one and the same hope, one and the same Lord, one and the same faith, one and the same baptism, one and the same God; but this is not all; they have one and the same administration of the Spirit, but this is a possession which differs in character from the rest. All belong to the body, all have their share of the Spirit, all have the hope of eternal life, all are members of Christ, all are believers, all are baptized, all are God's children, but all have not the function of administering the Spirit. This was given to individual recipients according as Christ chose to bestow it, so that some had that special part of it which belonged to apostles, some that which belonged to prophets, some that which belonged to evangelists, some that which belonged to pastors and teachers, some had no part in it at all, though it was for the benefit of all. The translation "every one" obscures the connexion of thought; "each" is used in contrast with "all," not as synonymous with it. This grace was bestowed not on "all" Christians, as such, but on one and another individual according as "each" was called to this or that office in the ministry.

*is given grace*] **was given grace.** The grace given is particularized in its several parts in *v.* 11; it was the grace that was administered by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers in their several functions.

*according to the measure of the gift of Christ*] Christ dispenses this manifold and multiform grace to individuals according as, and in what measure, He pleases. See 1 Cor. xii. 4—11.

8—10 (parenthetical). APPLICATION OF PS. LXVIII. 18 TO CHRIST'S GIFT OF THE SPIRIT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION.

8. *Wherefore*] Christ had indissolubly connected the gift of the Holy Ghost with His own Ascension to the Father in heaven. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (John xvi. 7, 16); and whereas Ps. lxviii. 18 speaks of an Ascension and of gifts in connexion with it, St Paul quotes the passage and applies it to Christ, justifying his citation in the two following verses. The course of thought and argument proceeds immediately from *v.* 7 to *v.* 11.

*he saith*] Or "it saith," viz. the Scripture. Cf. Rom. x. 11; Gal. iv. 30.

*When he ascended*, &c.] The Psalm describes a triumphant procession of God after He has won a victory for His people. He is described as leading captive His prisoners, and receiving gifts betokening submission from the vanquished for the good of all mankind, and so returning in glory to heaven. St Paul reveals the spiritual bearing of the passage. Now it means that the Messiah, after having won His victory and taken captive His enemies, returned to heaven and there received gifts, not from the subjected nations but from His Father, which He then gave to men for their spiritual good and edification. So St Peter says (Acts ii. 33), "Being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this (the Pentecostal gift) which ye now see and hear." In St Peter's address, as here, the gifts "received from the Father" by the Son, and "given unto men" by Him, are those of the Holy Spirit, dispensed to the Church by those on whom the Spiritual gifts and ministerial offices were bestowed.

*When he ascended up on high*] Paraphrased from "Thou hast ascended up on high," Ps. lxviii. 18.

*he led captivity captive*] "Thou hast led captivity (that is, captives) captive" (*ib.*). See Judges v. 12. The captives that Christ made were "the devil, and death, and the curse, and sin" (Chrys.); "sin, death and Satan" (Calvin); "Satan and all Adam's progeny" (Bp. Andrewes). "For all the world as when an English ship takes a Turkish galley, wherein are held many Christian captives at the oars. Both are taken, Turks and Christians, both

Digitized by Google

9 (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?

10 He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might [1]fill all things.)

11 [b]And he gave some, apostles;

[1] Or, *fulfil.*

[b] 1 Cor. 12. 28.

---

become captive to the English ship. The poor souls in the galley when they see the English hath the upper hand, are glad, I dare say, so to be taken: they know it will turn to their letting go. So was it with us: they to whom we were captive were taken captives themselves, and we with them. So both came into Christ's hands; they and we his prisoners both" (Id. 'Serm. VII. on the sending of the Holy Ghost').

*and gave gifts unto men*] In Ps. lxviii. "Thou hast received gifts for man or in man (or for men or among men)." The Hebrew word translated "received" in the Psalm and "gave" by St Paul is frequently used in the sense of "to take for the purpose of giving to another." It is thus used in Gen. xviii. 5, xxvii. 13, xlii. 16 (where it is translated in the A.V. by "fetch," *e.g.* "Fetch me a little water that I may drink"), and in Ex. xxvii. 20; Lev. xxiv. 2; 2 K. ii. 20 (where it is translated by "bring," *e.g.* "Bring me a new cruse ...and they brought it to him." The context indicates that it is so used in Ps. lxviii. 18, the acceptance of the gifts being for the benefit of men. See note *ad loc.*

**9.** *Now that he ascended*] In this and the following verse St Paul justifies his citation from the Psalm on the ground that it refers to Christ, for, he argues, a divine Ascension to heaven must be made by one who is below; Christ was below, for He had descended from heaven to earth; therefore it is Christ that is meant in the Psalm by the one who ascended up on high—not the Father who is ever everywhere. Cf. John iii. 13, "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven."

*descended first into the lower parts of the earth?*] The word "first" is of doubtful authority and **places** should be substituted in italics for "parts." "The lower places of the earth" means simply (as in Isai. xliv. 23) "the lower earth," so called in contrast with the heaven above (lit. "the places lower than heaven, which places are of, *i.e.* constituted by, the earth"). A not inconsiderable array of commentators suppose that the Descent into Hades is referred to in the words.

**10.** *He that descended is the same also that ascended*] **He that descended, he it is also that ascended.**

*above all heavens*] **above all the heavens,** to the right hand of God. Cf. Heb. iv. 14, "a great High Priest that is passed *through* the heavens." The third heaven is spoken of in 2 Cor. xii. 2, and the heaven of heavens in Deut. x. 14; 1 K. viii. 27; Ps. lxviii. 33, cxlviii. 4. "Whatsoever heaven is higher than all the rest which is called heavens, whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those courts above, into that place did He ascend, where He was before He took upon Him our humanity." Pearson, 'Expos. of the Creed,' Art. VI.

*that he might fill all things*] "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord" (Jer. xxiii. 24). Christ's ascension to the highest heaven shews that He has this divine prerogative. He fills the whole universe by His presence, mightiness and glory, and in an especial manner He, the fulness of perfection (i. 23), filled the Church with the gifts of the Spirit which on His ascension He received from His Father and gave to men.

**11.** *And he gave*] Resumed from *v.* 7. The pronoun is emphatic, "And it was He that gave." What He gave was that grace of the Holy Spirit which was administered, when given, by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. All of these "ministered the Spirit" (Gal. iii. 5), each in his own way and degree, according to his function (1 Cor. xii. 29).

*apostles*] The grace ministered by Apostles, as such, was that of Government. They were sent forth by the Holy Ghost as the ambassadors of God, first to found Churches (ii. 20), and next to govern them. Others might convert, feed, and teach; Apostles organised and governed. To qualify them for this task, they received a direct commission from Christ (John xx. 21; Gal. i. 1), whose witnesses they were (Acts i. 22), and a special inspiration by the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. ii. 10; Eph. iii. 4, 5), as had been promised them (John xvi. 13); they were endowed with a supreme authority which none might gainsay (1 Cor. xiv. 37; 2 Cor. x. 8), and a power of working miracles to prove their claims (2 Cor. xii. 12). Thus qualified, there was laid upon them "the care of all the Churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28). In the exercise of this care, they had to organize Churches by the appointment of proper officers, as deacons (Acts vi. 2—7), presbyters (Acts xiv. 23), and Apostolic Delegates, afterwards called Bishops (Tit. i. 5); to maintain the true doctrine (Gal. i. 9); to enforce discipline in respect to morals (1 Cor. v. 3), ceremonies (1 Cor. xi. 2), religious practices (1 Cor. xvi. 1), and general conduct (2 Cor. xiii. 10); and to set forward love (1 John ii. 10; 2 John 5). As the Apostolic band died out, the gift of Government was continued to their delegates and successors



Digitized by Google

and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers;

12 For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:

13 Till we all come [1]in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the [1]stature of the fulness of Christ:

14 That we *henceforth* be no more

[1] Or, *into the unity.*

[1] Or, *age.*

---

(1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 6, 11, 14; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 5, ii. 15; Rev. ii. 1, 2), while the extraordinary qualifications with which they were endowed died out with themselves.

*prophets*] The grace ministered by prophets, as such, was that of Exposition. They shared with Apostles the revelation of mysteries made by the Holy Ghost (iii. 5), and it was their special task to expound those mysteries to such as had been wholly or partially converted by Apostolic preaching, the result being that they "edified, exhorted and comforted" believers (1 Cor. xiv. 3) and convinced unbelievers of the truth of Christianity by impassioned appeals to their consciences (*ib.* 25). Their utterances were ordinarily argumentative and oratorical, not exstatic (*ib.* 33). Their grace was generally exercised at the public meetings of the brethren. Like the Old Testament Prophets, they may have made use of the instrumentality of sacred song (1 S. x. 5), and occasionally, like them, they had the gift of prediction (Acts xi. 28). See Art. "Prophet" in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

*evangelists*] The grace ministered by evangelists, as such, was that of Conversion. They were what modern missionaries are, except that their work was only to preach. They left the organization of congregations to the Apostles, whose function it was to govern. They had simply to tell the good news—to preach Christ crucified and to carry from city to city the good tidings of salvation. One part of Timothy's functions was to be an evangelist (2 Tim. iv. 5), and we read of Philip the evangelist (Acts xxi. 8). Otherwise the title of evangelist is not found in the New Testament. Evangelists are not mentioned among Church officers in the parallel passage of 1 Cor. xii. 28, probably because they are not there distinguished from pastors and teachers, but regarded as one division of the latter.

*pastors and teachers*] The grace ministered by pastors and teachers was that of Spiritual Edification. The same class of persons is designated by the two titles, and by it is meant the clergy inferior in rank to the Apostles, whose double office it was "to feed the church of God" (Acts xx. 28) and "to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2), "to exhort and convince" (Tit. i. 9), at once pastors and teachers. This ministry, unlike that of the prophets, was to be perpetually exercised in the Church. The grace of Government is continued to bishops, that of Edification to presbyters. No mention of the Diaconate is made here, probably on account of its inferior character, or possibly because the two gifts which qualified for the diaconate and for evangelism were always bestowed together, as they undoubtedly were in the case of Stephen and Philip (see Introduction and Notes to the Acts).

The fourfold grace of the Holy Ghost, given to men by Christ, and ministered by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, though bestowed, not on all Christians, but on those only on whom God willed to bestow it, may yet be regarded as a single treasure, held in common *for*, if not *by* all alike, no less than the body, the Spirit, the hope, the Lord, the faith, the baptism, the Father already enumerated.

**12.** *For the perfecting of the saints*] **With a view to the perfecting of the saints.** This is the final object of the ministry of the Spirit, introduced in the original by a different preposition from that which begins the next two clauses. The three clauses are not coordinate, as they appear to be in the A. V. The grace is given for the work of the ministry and for the edification of the body of Christ, in order that the saints may be perfected.

**13.** *Till we all come*] By "we all" is meant the collective body of believers. The Spirit's grace is ministered in order that the Church may come, and it will be ministered until the Church comes, to the state of perfect maturity described in the following words, but the individual members of the body may any of them stumble and fall: Apostles did not count themselves to have attained (Phil. iii. 12).

*in the unity*] **unto the unity.** There are three things to which the grace ministered in the Church is to lead it: 1. "Unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God," that is, one and the same belief and confession of his Divine nature; 2. "A perfect man," that is, full manhood, characterized by the steadfastness and firmness of one who has ceased to be a child and has reached mid-age;" 3. "The measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," that is, the matured growth of full development, which is completely possessed by Christ, who is the fulness of all divine perfection, and to which His disciples may aspire and in their degree approach. The expression "measure of the stature" is found in Lucian ('Imagin.').

**14.** *That*] In order that.

Digitized by Google

children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, *and* cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;

15 But [1]speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, *even* Christ:

[1] Or, *being sincere.*

16 [c]From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.

[c] Col. 2. 19.

17 This I say therefore, and tes-

---

*no more children*] Or, "infants." Contrasted with the man of mature age of the previous verse. The same two words are set in opposition to each other in Polyb. 'Hist.,' v. 29. 2. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

*and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive*] **and by crafty action tending to cunningly deceiving error** (lit. "to the cunning deceit of error," *i.e.* "to error which cunningly deceives"). St Paul refers to the heresiarchs against whom he had warned the Ephesians three years ago as "men who should arise out of themselves, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts xx. 30). He warns the Colossians against the same deceivers in the Epistle to the Colossians, and the Ephesians in the Epistle to Timothy.

**15.** *speaking the truth in love*] That is, "being truthful and loving." Manly steadfastness in the truth, and a bold confession of it when assailed, are opposed to the childish weakness which gives ear to every new thing, and allows itself to be beguiled by the specious or ingenious arguments of such as have a false system to defend. This steadfastness and boldness in the faith are to be joined with charity; which avoids giving offence by unnecessary harshness, and convinces opponents that the motives of opposition are not imperiousness or bigotry, but the claims of truth and the love of souls. (It has been proposed to join the words "in love" with the verb following by Harless, Meyer, Olshausen, Eadie.)

*may grow up into him*] **unto Him.** The mystical body is to grow up to the standard of the Head, fully developed as that is, so that there may be symmetry between the two.

**16.** *From whom*] Grace is ministered to the body in order that it may grow up unto the Head, but it is only by being attached to the Head and dependent upon It, that it can thus "make increase of itself." Detached from the Head it can make no growth.

*the whole body*, &c.] The figure is that of a human frame being solidly constructed, in dependence on its head, of parts well adapted to each other, and knit together by the instrumentality of the joints (see Col. ii. 19), each limb and part fulfilling its own work properly, and the general result being an harmonious and proportionate growth of the whole body.

*according to the effectual working in the measure of every part*] That is, "according to the effective working of each part in due proportion."

*of the body*] The sentence runs "The whole body...worketh increase of the body," that is, "of itself." The noun is repeated in substitution for the pronoun, because the nominative case is so far off.

*in love*] The physical image is dropped, or rather it passes into the thing represented by it. Without harmony of its parts, the natural body cannot grow to its perfection, nor can the spiritual body unless there be love among its members. Its organization may be perfect; "every joint" may be there, "every part" in its place; but unless the vital energy descend from the Head and the Spirit of love pervade the members, there is no spiritual growth or edification.

With this verse ends the specially doctrinal portion of the Epistle. The subject of it has been one throughout, whether presented in the form of thanksgiving (i. 3—16), or prayers (i. 17—ii. 10, iii. 14—21), or warning (ii. 11—22), or protestation (iii. 1—13), or exhortation (iv. 1—16); and that subject has been the Adoption in Christ and the consequences flowing from it, ending, as the last word, in the growth and edification of the Church in love. Nor is the pervading thought of the Adoption lost sight of in the hortative section which now follows, for the ground on which the Ephesians are bidden to lead religious lives is that they have already put off the old man and put on the new man (see note on iv. 22, 24), and have been already sealed by the Holy Spirit as God's children in Christ (v. 30).

17—32, v. 1—21. Exhortation to moral life and piety on the ground of having been adopted in Christ and regenerated. Cf. Col. iii. 5—16, iv. 5, 6.

**17.** *This I say therefore*] St Paul glances back to iv. 1 and resumes the exhortation there begun, that they should walk worthy of their Christian vocation. How were they to do this? First by love and unity among themselves (iv. 2—16), next by holiness (iv. 17—24) and general moral and religious behaviour (iv. 25—32, v. 1—21).

*and testify in the Lord*] That is, "and

Digitized by Google

tify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind,

18 Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the [d] [1] blindness of their heart:

19 Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.

20 But ye have not so learned Christ;

21 If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus:

22 That ye put off concerning the

[d] Rom. i. 21.
[1] Or, *hardness.*

---

charge you as a Christian addressing Christians."

*other Gentiles*] **the Gentiles.** St Paul is addressing, among others, the Gentile members of the Church in Asia, but they had ceased to be Gentiles in the sense of aliens, since the blessing of adoption in Christ had been vouchsafed to them, and they had been brought into the house of God. The word "other" is omitted in all the MSS. of highest authority.

*in the vanity of their mind*] The vanity spoken of does not mean here or elsewhere in the A. V. self-conceit, but the "vanity" of which the Preacher and the Psalmist speak (Eccl. i. 2; Ps. xxxix. 5, cxliv. 4), to which all were given up who had not the reality of a Revelation from God to rest on. The quick-witted Greeks of Asia speculated upon the Good, the True, the Beautiful, the First Cause, and such topics; but what they arrived at was no more than a vain Atheism, or an equally vain Pantheism, or a vainer Superstition, leading them, in despair and apathy, to throw themselves back upon the life according to the passions which at least seemed real. Cf. Rom. i. 21.

**18.** *alienated from the life of God*] That is, from the life as it was when imparted to unfallen man by God, its author, which continues to animate man as long as he is in communion with God. Cf. Ps. xxxvi. 9, "For with thee is the well of life."

*because of the blindness of their heart*] **because of the callousness of their heart.** Two reasons are given for the alienation of the heathen from God: 1. ignorance, that is, inability to apprehend God's nature and dealings; 2. callousness, which did not try to please Him. See notes on Rom. i. 21—28.

**19.** *being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness*] A description of those who have had high and warm feelings of piety, and, as they say of themselves, have gone through them, and have become apathetic. The natural result of this sceptical apathy is that men abandon themselves, after a pause, to wantonness, or if they do not themselves sink so far, their disciples do; and thus it is that an age of scepticism is usually followed by an age of licence.

*with greediness*] **in greediness.** The word here happily rendered by "greediness," and generally translated "covetousness," is very frequently associated with words bearing the meaning of uncleanness (1 Cor. vi. 10; Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 6). Etymologically it signifies "getting more than a due share," and it was originally applied to those who sought to satisfy their avaricious desires, but soon it came to be applied also to those who sought to satisfy their fleshly desires. The word concupiscence has had a somewhat similar history. "Greediness" is the best rendering, as that word is applicable to excessive indulgence both of appetite and of the love of money.

**20.** *learned Christ*] That is, "become Christ's disciples." The word translated "learned" is the verb from which is derived the substantive "disciple."

**21.** *If so be*] This formula does not express a doubt of its being so. See note on iii. 2. Translate "If ye heard Him, as I know ye did."

*ye have heard him, and have been taught by him*] **ye heard Him and were taught in Him.** The disciple is "a hearer" and the Master is "the teacher," though they have not seen each other in the flesh (cf. John x. 27).

*as the truth is in Jesus: That ye put off, &c.*] The best way of constructing and understanding this difficult clause is to join the words "in Jesus" with the following verb. The sentence will then run, "**If so be that ye heard Him and were taught in Him, as truth is, namely, that in Jesus ye did put off the old man..., and are being renewed by the Spirit.**" Verses 22—24 do not contain an exhortation to put off the old man, but a repetition and reminder of the teaching that they had received, the subject of that teaching having been that on the occasion of their conversion, when they were adopted in Christ and so first came to be "in Jesus," they had put off the old man and put on the new man; the conclusion to be drawn from such teaching being that "they should walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4), and not "as the Gentiles walked" (iv. 17).

**22.** *concerning the former conversation*] That is, in regard to your conduct and habits

Digitized by Google

former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;

23 And be renewed in the spirit of your mind;

24 And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousnesss and [1] true holiness.

25 Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another.

26 Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath:

27 Neither give place to the devil.

[1] Or, *holiness of truth.*

---

up to the present time. The same word is used in Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 12.

*the old man*] the old self which belonged to them in their heathen days, and which they put off once for all when admitted into covenant with God and sealed with the Spirit. In the parallel passage of the Epistle to the Colossians (iii. 10) the putting off the old man and putting on the new man are, as here, represented as things past, and the renewing as a thing still going on. The time when the putting off and on took place is indicated in Col. ii. 11 and in Rom. vi. 4, and plainly stated in Gal. iii. 27 to be that of their baptism.

*which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts*] **which proceeds from worse to worse in accordance with the strong desires which lead it astray.** This presently-progressive state of corruption finds its issue in absolute destruction and ruin. Cf. Gal. vi. 8.

**23.** *And be renewed*] **And are being** (day by day) **renewed.** This, he reminds them, is what they had been taught.

*in the spirit of your mind*] Probably "by the Spirit who dwells within you." But it may signify the human soul, in which case it would indicate that the Divine renewing affects, not the constituent elements of the mind, but its spirit or ruling principle, which directs its impulses in one way or another. "The spirit is the inmost part of the mind" (Bengel).

**24.** *And that ye put on the new man*] **And that ye did put on the new man.** He is still recounting what they had been taught.

*which after God is created*] **which after God was created.** The new creation after the image of God takes place but once (though that image may be often renewed, Col. iii. 10); it had taken place on the occasion of the conversion of the Ephesians and their admission to the Church. We learn from this passage that the image of God, after which the regenerate man is re-created, consists of righteousness and true holiness (lit. holiness of truth).

**25.** *Wherefore*] From the fundamental truths of this regeneration and daily renewal, in which they had been all along instructed, St Paul proceeds to draw practical conclusions.

*putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour*] **having put away lying,** *i.e.* since you put away lying. The same precept is given in the same apparently arbitrary connexion in Col. iii. 9, 10 (a coincidence which Paley has not failed to note and argue from with ingenuity and effect in his 'Horæ Paulinæ'). Truth-telling is an essential and fundamental quality of Christian morality, and one cause of the binding nature of the duty is given in the next few words: "We are members one of another," as belonging to the family of man, and forming the Christian household, and as such, we have a right to truth, not only to words true in the speaker's acceptance of them while they mislead the hearer, but to *truth*, from our neighbour, and our neighbour from us. On this axiom rests all social trust, and therefore society. Without it there can be no true union civil or ecclesiastical. The words in the text are quoted from Zech. viii. 16.

**26.** *Be ye angry, and sin not*] This is a quotation from the LXX. version of Ps. iv. 4, where the A. V. has "Stand in awe, and sin not." See note *ad loc.* That there is an indignation which is righteous is the teaching of all systems of sound morality. The conditions under which this righteous anger becomes sinful are laid down in Bishop Butler's 'Sermon on Resentment.' They are (1) "when from partiality to ourselves we imagine an injury done us, when there is none;" (2) "when this partiality represents it to us greater than it really is;" (3) "when we feel resentment on account of pain or inconvenience without injury;" (4) "when indignation rises too high;" (5) "when pain or harm is inflicted to gratify that resentment though naturally raised" ('Sermon' VIII.).

*wrath*] This word is used here to designate anger run into excess.

**27.** *Neither give place to the devil*] That is, "And do not, thus or otherwise, give room to the devil and his working." Anger, fostered and nursed, opens an inlet into the heart for the evil spirit, whose working there changes what was at first innocent into the malice which is the characteristic of himself.

Digitized by Google

28 Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with *his* hands the thing which is good, that he may have [1]to give to him that needeth.

[1] Or, *to distribute.*

29 Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good [1]to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.

[1] Or, *to edify profitably.*

30 And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.

31 Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice:

32 And [c]be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.

[c] 2 Cor. 2. 10.

---

On the expression "give place" see Wetstein on Rom. xii. 19.

**28.** *Let him that stole*] **Let the pilferer.** This is a warning against the pilfering usual among slaves. Converts from this class might not yet have unlearned all their old habits in deference to their new principles

*that he may have to give to him that needeth*] so as to deliver others from the temptation which he has found too strong in his own case. The hope of saving others is to some minds a stronger motive than the mere duty of restitution or of self-maintenance.

**29.** *to the use of edifying*] **for building up as may be needed.** "To edify the hearers according as place, time, and person require" (Jerome). On the effect of words, for good and evil, see Four Sermons by Bishop Jeremy Taylor (xxii...xxvi), and Bishop Butler's Sermon 'On the government of the tongue.'

*minister grace*] **confer a blessing upon.**

**30.** *grieve not the holy Spirit of God*] The juxtaposition shews that it will be by lying, wrath, dishonesty, and corrupt conversation that He will be grieved, and these are the vices which have a tendency to dissolve the spiritual society, the Church, within which He dwells. There is no more difficulty in conceiving the thought of the indwelling Spirit being grieved by such sins on the part of the members of the body, than of the sins and miseries of men raising the feelings of anger and compassion in the Father. The Personality of the Holy Ghost may be proved from the expression in the text (see Pearson, 'Expos. of the Creed,' Art. VIII.).

*whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption*] **by whom ye were sealed for the day of redemption.** At the time of their adoption they were sealed in the sacrament of baptism (see i. 13, 14), and they then received the earnest of the Spirit, which it was God's purpose that they should retain and receive in ever-increasing abundance up to the day of final redemption or deliverance. Yet though it be God's purpose that there should be this advance in the Christian life from the day of baptism to the day of redemption, we are warned that the Spirit, though once given, may be resisted (Acts vii. 51), vexed (Isai. lxiii. 10), grieved (Eph. iv. 30), quenched (1 Thess. v. 19), so as to depart from us. There is no security of final salvation to any individual from his having been adopted in Christ and sealed by the Spirit. "See that you break not the seal," says Theophylact.

**31** *Let all bitterness, &c.*] "Bitterness" is the frame of mind which wilfully retains angry feelings (Arist. 'Eth. Nic.' IV. 5). Ephesus, we may note, was the birthplace of the poet, Hipponax, called from the character of his writings "the bitter." "Wrath" is that excitement of feeling which often arises from an imagination of an insult offered to us. "Anger"—that is, all that anger which is not righteous (see iv. 26). "Clamour," the loud tone and furious recrimination of passionate men and women. "Evil-speaking," the baser result of passion which leads men to revile or attack the reputation of those with whom they are angry. "Malice," the bad-heartedness or malignity from which all evil-doing proceeds. Sometimes this word is used in a restricted sense (Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8).

**32.** *And be ye*] **But become ye, that is,** in contrast to the vices above-mentioned continue to make progress towards the opposite graces. They have already been adopted, regenerated, sealed; they have already put off the old man and put on the new man, but still "the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek *phronema sarkos*...doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated" (Art. IX.), and is to be overcome.

*forgiving one another*] lit. "giving freely to each other," whether pardon for wrongs, or anything else that it becomes brothers to give to brothers.

*even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you*] **even as God in Christ gave freely unto you.** God's free gift to them had been that of adoption, including in itself forgiveness of sins. He gave it them "in Christ," that is, as Christians, and because they belonged to Christ's body (see ii. 13). "Even as" shews that we are to take God's dealings with us as a model for our dealing with our neighbour. The lesson here inculcated is the same as that in the parable of the

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER V.

1 *After general exhortations, to love,* 3 *to fly fornication,* 4 *and all uncleanness,* 7 *not to converse with the wicked,* 15 *to walk warily, and to be* 18 *filled with the Spirit,* 22 *he descendeth to the particular duties, how wives ought to obey their husbands,* 25 *and husbands ought to love their wives,* 32 *even as Christ doth his church.*

BE ye therefore followers of God, as dear children;

2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour.

3 But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints;

4 Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

5 For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

---

Unmerciful Servant. There the King has pity first, and the servant is bound to have compassion in imitation of his Master's mercy, not in hope that mercy will in the future be extended to him. So now, we are to forgive, not because we hope for God's forgiveness hereafter, but because as Christians we have been forgiven by Him. (The reading "you" is right, but "us" has some MS. authority.)

CHAP. V. 1. *Be ye therefore followers of God*] Lit. "Become then imitators of God," in respect to freely giving and forgiving, and loving one another; and this they are to do as they are themselves "dear or beloved children," not from the slavish fear of punishment if they do not, or the equally slavish hope of earning benefit to themselves if they do, but in the spirit of filial love, which copies the beloved father's acts and principles, and cannot but give love for love.

2. *hath loved us, and hath given himself for us*] **loved us and gave Himself for us.**

*an offering and a sacrifice*] The antitype of all the sacrificial offerings of the old dispensation; the true sacrifice for sin by which expiation was wrought; the foreshadowed burnt-offering, whose self-surrender was "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18); the effective Peace-offering, exhibiting restored communion between God and man. The phrase "a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour" belongs to the burnt-offering, the meat-offering and the peace-offering. (Lev. i. 9, ii. 2, iii. 5.) Ignatius adopts the expression, 'Epist. ad Ephes' 1. The love of Christ exhibiting itself in the sacrifice of Himself is set before Christians as the model and the motive of their love to each other. Cf. John xv. 12, 13.

3. *or covetousness*] Rather, **greediness.** See note on iv. 19. The use of "or" instead of "and" may be noted, but too much stress must not be laid upon it, as in the very next verse "jesting" is in an exactly parallel manner coupled to "foolish talking" by the disjunctive conjunction.

4. *Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting*] **And filthiness, and foolish talking, or jesting.** "Filthiness" is indecency; "foolish talking," the coarse talk of fools; "jesting," the more refined half-suggestion of vice or profanity in the conversation or writing of a witty man of the world.

*but rather giving of thanks*] The Greek word is rendered by some as "agreeableness," in the sense of Shakespeare's "gracious fooling," having in it no coarseness or equivoke like the "jesting" just reprobated; but there is no sufficient authority for such use of the word, nor is such a signification in accordance with the Apostle's mind. See below, *v.* 19, and Phil. iv. 6.

5. *For this ye know*] **For this ye know and understand.**

*nor covetous man, who is an idolater*] **nor greedy man.** See note on iv. 19, and cf. Col. iii. 5, "covetousness, which is idolatry." As avaricious men make gold their god, so there are others whose god is their belly. Thus the "greedy" man is in both senses of the word an idolater, whether he indulge his miserly or his fleshly desires.

*hath any inheritance*] **hath inheritance.** St Paul has told the Ephesians that they "had obtained an inheritance" (i. 11) and received its earnest (i. 14), and yet he now tells them that they have no inheritance if they are guilty of uncleanness or greed, shewing that "after we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given" (Art. XVI.), and lose the inheritance which was ours. At the time that the A.V. was made there was no distinction in the meaning of the English words "inheritance" and "possession," as may be seen from Shakespeare's habitual use of the words "inheritance" and "inherit."

*in the kingdom of Christ and of God*] The signification of these words is not to be confined either to the Church on earth or to the future

Digitized by Google

6 Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of [1]disobedience.

[1] Or, *unbelief.*

7 Be not ye therefore partakers with them.

8 For ye were sometimes darkness, but now *are ye* light in the Lord: walk as children of light:

9 (For the fruit of the Spirit *is* in all goodness and righteousness and truth;)

10 Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord.

11 And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove *them.*

12 For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

13 But all things that are [1]reproved are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light.

[1] Or, *discovered.*

14 Wherefore he saith, [a]Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.

[a] Isai. 60. 1.

---

kingdom of heaven. In the former of these we receive the earnest of our inheritance, given to us in baptism but liable to be forfeited; in the latter we receive the whole inheritance, that inheritance being in fact the full possession of the Holy Spirit of God. Each of these kingdoms is Christ's kingdom, as He is the Head and King of it, and at the same time God's kingdom, as it is He that has committed the government of the Church, militant and triumphant, to His Son.

**6.** *Let no man deceive you with vain words*] St Paul's words contain a warning against the Gnostic justification of vice as an indifferent thing, as well as against the foolish bravado of the profligate man.

*cometh*] in this world (Rom. i. 27), and "is coming" in the next world (Rev. xxi. 8).

*children of disobedience*] See ii. 2. The marginal reading "unbelief" is not so good a rendering.

**7.** *Be not ye*] Lit. "Become not ye." If they did so, it would be a falling away from the state in which they had been placed.

**8.** *in the Lord*] as Christians. Cf. Matt. v. 16.

**9.** *the fruit of the Spirit*] **the fruit of light**, according to all the better MSS. The reading in the text is probably derived from Gal. v. 22.

**10.** *Proving*, &c.] The test of a thing being right or wrong is its being acceptable or unacceptable to the Lord, and the proof of a thing being acceptable to the Lord would be the approval given to it by the divinely enlightened conscience of the regenerate man.

**11.** *unfruitful works of darkness*] Works which contrast in character with the good, righteous and true works which are the works of light (*v.* 9). Cf. Gal. v. 19—22.

*but rather reprove them*] **but rather even reprove them.** The manner in which St Paul carried out this precept officially may be seen in the case of the incestuous Corinthian (1 Cor. v. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 7). Sharp reproof ends in affectionate forgiveness of the penitent.

**12.** *For it is a shame even to speak of those things*] And therefore there is the greater reason for reproof on the part of those whose duty it is to reprove.

**13.** *But all things that are reproved are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light*] **But all of them, being reproved, are manifested by the light; for everything that is manifested is light.** The Apostle has desired that the works of darkness be reproved (*v.* 11), and he adds that reproof will make the true character of all of them to be seen, as though a flood of light were thrown upon them, it being the function of light to cause things on which it falls to be clearly discerned, and, St Paul adds, to be transformed themselves into light. The word "manifested" must be taken passively in both clauses, in the sense of "lit up."

**14.** *he saith*] Either "it saith," in the indefinite form in which citations are sometimes made from a source well known to the person addressed, or possibly "the Holy Spirit saith." Probably it is a quotation from an early Christian hymn (an opinion dating as early as the time of Theodoret). This Epistle having been written about A.D. 62, sufficient time had elapsed for some "psalm" (1 Cor. xiv. 26) to have become of general use. It might have been the morning hymn used each day by the Christians in Rome when they assembled for prayer at St Paul's lodging, or it might have been a baptismal hymn used liturgically in all the churches founded by St Paul. The words quoted run as follows:

Ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων,
Καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν·
Καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός,

Digitized by Google

[b] Col. 4. 5.

15 [b]See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise,

16 Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.

17 Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord *is*.

18 And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit;

19 Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord;

20 Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father

---

which may be translated:

Sleeper awake! Rise from the dead!
And Christ on thee His light shall shed.

The somewhat unusual form of two of the Greek words may perhaps be accounted for on rhythmical grounds. The hymn is naturally founded on Scriptural words and texts, as "Arise, shine, for thy light has come and the glory of the Lord has risen upon thee" (Isai. lx. 1); "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth her dead" (Isai. xxvi. 19); "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death upon them hath the light shined" (Isai. ix. 2). But none of these passages can be said to be cited by St Paul.

**15.** *then*] The reference is specially to the first clause of *v.* 11, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness."

*that ye walk circumspectly*] Rather "strictly." Paley, in his 'Horae Paulinae,' not very happily, proposes the word "correctly," and finds in it the same idea as that expressed by "in wisdom towards those that are without" (Col. iv. 5). The original includes within it two exhortations, (1) "See that ye walk strictly," (2) "See how you so walk."

**16.** *Redeeming the time*] Rather, "Buying up for yourselves the opportunity," that is, seizing every opportunity of wise dealing that is offered you, whatever price you have to pay in having to forego the solicitations of indolence and self-indulgence. The expression is found in Dan. ii. 8, and is no doubt borrowed from thence by St Paul. Nebuchadnezzar there complains that the astrologers are buying the time for themselves with a view to wasting it in vain delays: St Paul bids Christians buy the time for themselves (by the sacrifice of their own comforts) in order to use it in wise action. Seneca has a saying of like kind: "Gather up and preserve the time" ('Ep. Mor.' I. 1), and a similar idea is found in his 'De Brev. Vit.' I.

*because the days are evil*] They were the days of Nero. But in each age the Church has made, and has been justified in making, the same lament.

**17.** *Wherefore*] Referring back to *v.* 15.

**18.** *excess*] That is, riotous excess and prodigality or profligacy. See Arist. 'Eth. Nic.' IV. 1, where it stands as the vice on one side of liberality, answering to illiberality on the other. The use of wine in moderation is formally approved in 1 Tim. v. 23, and implied here.

*filled with the Spirit*] The source of true religious enthusiasm is not bodily or mental excitement but a Divine spiritual impulse. It is contrasted here, as in Acts ii. 13, with the exhilaration caused by wine, but it exhibits itself in an orderly manner—in "psalms," that is, utterances such as those of David, "hymns," that is, addresses made directly to God, such as the *Gloria in excelsis*, and "spiritual songs," that is, compositions generally classed if not confounded with hymns, though not directly addressed to God, such as that which has been already quoted (verse 14), or Ken's "Morning Hymn." Others explain the difference between the three words otherwise. "Psalms," they say, are songs with musical accompaniment, "hymns" are without accompaniment, and "spiritual songs" are lyrical effusions. For the early Christian habit of singing antiphonally, see Pliny, 'Ep.' x. 97.

**19.** *singing and making melody in your heart*] "Singing" is the word from which "song" is derived; "making melody" (in the original) that from which "psalm" is derived. Spiritual enthusiasm creates an inner music in the heart as well as the utterance aloud of psalm, hymn, and song. See 'Christian Year,' S. Matthew's Day.

**20, 21.** *Giving thanks...submitting yourselves*] Two more effects of the presence of God's Spirit are noted—constant thankfulness welling up from a full heart, and a meek and quiet spirit which abhors the egotism that makes a man give and take offence for fear of not seeming to be on an equality with another. The thankfulness is to be not only for those things which we at once acknowledge as blessings, but for "all things," including chastisement and disappointment. The submission is not to be from slavishness of disposition or unmanly cringing, but "in the fear of Christ," that is, from a religious motive, nay more, from a thought which flies back at once to the precept of Christ, "Whosoever shall

Digitized by Google

in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;

21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

22 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.

23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.

24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so *let* the wives *be* to their own husbands in every thing.

25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

26 That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,

---

smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matt. v. 39).

*in the fear of God*] **in the fear of Christ**, by the authority of all the best MSS.

22—33, vi. 1—9. RELATIONS OF CHRISTIAN HUSBANDS AND WIVES (22—33), PARENTS AND CHILDREN (vi. 1—4), MASTERS AND SLAVES (5—9). Cf. Col. iii. 18—25, iv. 1.

**22.** *submit yourselves*] These words should be printed in italics. They are borrowed in sense from the "submitting yourselves" of the previous verse, but are not expressed except according to the reading of a few MSS. The general precept of submission to one another, in *v.* 21, leads to the particular instructions for its application contained in this section of the Epistle.

*as unto the Lord*] This comparison is explained in the next verse. As the Church looks up to and obeys Christ, so in the ideal Christian family each Christian wife reverences and yields to her husband's will. Where the ideal cannot be attained through the husband's defects, it is still the aim of the wife to realize it so far as those defects admit of it. The headship of the husband implies not only that he holds authority, but also that the common life, which should animate both husband and wife, ought to have its source in the former.

**23.** *and he is the saviour of the body*] The two words "and" and "is" should be in italics. Christ, being the Head, is the preserver (saviour) of the body, the Church, which would necessarily perish, were it not for the life communicated to it from the head; and so the wife who separates herself from her husband by living in antagonism instead of submission to him is dead while she liveth, losing the life which through him might be hers. This passage is alluded to by Clement of Rome, 'Epist.' I. c. 38.

**24.** *Therefore*] **But.** The form of the argument is slightly confused. It should run thus—"The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church, *but* the Church is subject unto Christ, therefore the wives also to their husbands in everything." "But" is expressed by a strong adversative conjunction, because it answers a tacit objection on the part of the wife. Another explanation of the use of the adversative conjunction is to suppose that it marks the difference between the husband and Christ in respect to the last statement—"Although the husband is not the saviour of his wife, as Christ is of the Church, *yet* as the Church is subject to Christ, so also the wives to their husbands." The word "own" must be omitted from want of MS. authority.

*in every thing*] The duty of submission on the part of children and of slaves is laid down in equally broad terms in Col. iii. 20; Tit. ii. 9. The exceptions depend on the intervention of the higher principle or rule of obedience to God and His precepts.

**25.** *and gave himself for it*] Cf. Acts xx. 28. Man's love for woman, modelled on that of Christ for the Church, leads him if need be to sacrifice his life for the protection of his weaker partner, and to nourish and cherish her (*v.* 29). Woman's love for man, modelled on that of the Church for Christ, shews itself in the one duty of submission—a single duty, but of manifold application.

**26.** *That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water*] **that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the laver of the water.** First He cleansed it, then He made it holy. First comes justification, then sanctification; first baptism, then renewal by the Holy Ghost; and yet so closely are these acts of God in our behalf connected together, that no one can be justified without at the same time receiving the germ of sanctification, or baptized (aright) without receiving an earnest of the Spirit. "The laver of the water" is baptism, which as it is administered to each member of the Church is regarded and represented as administered to the Church in its corporate capacity. There is no reference to the ceremonial washings preceding an Eastern marriage, as some have thought. Cf. Acts xxii. 16; Heb. x. 22; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 11.

*by the word*] It cannot be certainly determined whether these words should be joined with the verb "that He might sanctify it," or

Digitized by Google

27 That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

28 So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.

29 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church:

30 For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

31 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.

32 This is a great mystery: but

---

with the participle **having cleansed it.** If the former, the lesson would be that Christ cleanses first by baptism and then sanctifies by the effect of the Word of the Gospel on the heart. If the latter, their intent would be to shew that it is not a mere material washing with water that cleanses but a mystical washing with water combined with belief in the Gospel. Cf. the parenthetical addition in 1 Pet. iii. 21 "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth even now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but an interrogatory of a good conscience towards God)." (See note *ad loc.*) The older commentators consider the form of words used in baptism to be meant.

**27.** *That he might present it to himself a glorious church*] **That he might himself present to himself the Church glorious.** Christ is not only bridegroom, but He bestows on Himself the bride, His purpose in giving Himself for His future Church being (1) to cleanse it, (2) to sanctify it, (3) to present it to Himself, thus glorious and holy, as a spotless bride (Cant. iv. 7). Viewed according to the Divine intention, the Church is even in this world glorious, without spot or wrinkle, holy and without blemish; but that divine intention will not be perfectly realized as long as man's will conflicts with God's will, that is, not in the Church Militant but only in the Church Triumphant.

**28.** *So*] That is, as Christ loves the Church which is the body of which He is the head, so husbands should love their wives as being the bodies of which they are the heads. The subject of comparison is the love of Christ not the love of a man's self, as would appear from the A.V. A comma should be inserted after "wives."

**29.** *no man ever yet hated his own flesh*] This seems to have been a proverbial saying. "I confess that love of our own body is natural to us." Seneca, 'Ep. Mor.' XIV. 1.

*even as the Lord the church*] **even as Christ the Church.** So the better MSS.

**30.** *of his flesh, and of his bones*] These words must be retained in spite of their absence from some of the best MSS. They have immediate reference to Gen. ii. 23, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh." The expression indicates that Christians, forming at once the mystical body and the spouse of Christ, are as closely identified with Christ, their Head and Lord, as was Eve with Adam from whose side she issued and whose wife she became.

**31.** *For this cause*, &c.] St Paul having alluded to Gen. ii. 23 in the words "of his flesh and of his bones," proceeds to quote the next verse, Gen. ii. 24, which confirms his doctrine of the affection which ought to exist between man and wife. Part of the same verse of Genesis is quoted in 1 Cor. vi. 16.

**32.** *This is a great mystery*] **This mystery is great.** The mystery is the analogy between the marriage-state and the spiritual union betwixt Christ and the Church. This had hitherto been a secret unrevealed thing, which was now first made clear (that is, it was "a mystery") and therefore the holiness of marriage was up to this time comparatively unknown, and the full force of the statement in Genesis, "they two shall be one flesh," had been unperceived. "But," continues the Apostle, "I" (the pronoun is emphatic) "refer this statement in its ultimate application to Christ and to the Church," and he thus explains what was before mysterious in Moses' words.

In consequence of the Vulgate using the word "sacramentum" here for "mystery," this passage is referred to by modern writers in the Latin Church as proving Marriage to be one of the supposed Seven Sacraments (see Conc. Trident. sess. XXIV. c. 1). The argument rests upon a mere equivoke. The term Sacrament in its restricted sense was not applied to marriage until the days of the Schoolmen, though St Augustine applies it freely to marriage and many other rites in its wider acceptation. But though no support can be derived from the passage for the theory that marriage was instituted by Christ as one of the sacraments of His Church (a theory which history plainly contradicts) yet the holiness of the estate is evidenced by it. Marriage is no mere contract, but a religious rite: it is no mere remedy to prevent incontinence, but a mystical representation of the union of God

Digitized by Google

I speak concerning Christ and the church.

33 Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife *see* that she reverence *her* husband.

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *The duty of children towards their parents,* 5 *of servants towards their masters.* 10 *Our life is a warfare,* 12 *not only against flesh and blood, but also spiritual enemies.* 13 *The complete armour of a Christian,* 18 *and how it ought to be used.* 21 *Tychicus is commended.*

CHILDREN, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right.

2 Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise;

3 That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

4 And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

5 Servants, be obedient to them that are *your* masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ;

6 Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart;

7 With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men:

---

with the soul, of Christ with the Church: it is not a thing to be tolerated as a concession to human weakness, or to be regarded as inferior to the estate of celibacy. For any "present distress" celibacy may be superior to marriage, but not as the normal condition of the Christian, though he were the highest Christian saint. (See Bishop Taylor's Sermons on 'The Marriage Ring,' Serm. XVII., XVIII.)

**33.** *Nevertheless*] "Apart from the mystical analogy that I have indicated."

*let every one of you in particular*] "See that you all in your individual capacities (whatever may be your corporate duties as forming the body of Christ)—see that each man of you, I say, love his wife as himself, and the woman that she fear her husband." Fear or reverence is a necessary condition of the submission already inculcated.

CHAP. VI. **1.** *in the Lord*] As ye are Christian children. On the mutual duties of Christian parents and children see Taylor, 'Ductor Dubitantium,' III. 5.

*for this is right*] St Paul here appeals to the principles of natural morality, as (in the next verse) to positive injunction.

**2.** *which is the first commandment with promise*] "which is the first of the Ten Commandments that has a promise attached to it." St Paul does not pause to consider or state whether or no there be any subsequent Commandment with promise; that the fifth is the first that occurs with it is sufficient for his purpose. Cf. the use of the word "Firstborn" in Matt. i. 25. The Second Commandment contains a declaration, not a promise: the Third, a threat.

**3.** *That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth*] **upon the land.** St Paul quotes so much of Exod. xx. 12 as is sufficient for his purpose, and omits the last clause, "which the Lord thy God giveth thee." His purpose is simply to recal to his hearers' memory the promise originally attached to the Fifth Commandment, not to suggest that the same temporal blessing there promised or any analogous spiritual blessing is now attached to filial obedience. That good promise shewed the great importance of the Fifth Commandment in God's eyes; and this is all that St Paul cites it for.

**4.** *the nurture and admonition of the Lord*] "the nurture, or rather discipline (see Trench, 'Synonyms of the N. T.'), and admonition which the Lord (*i.e.* Christ) directs should be used." Discipline or training comes first, and it passes as the boy grows to manhood, into admonition, consisting of encouragement, remonstrance, and sharp reproof, as each is needed. Eli did not "admonish" ("restrain" A. V.) his sons (1 Sam. iii. 13), though he remonstrated with them (ii. 24). Their case required sharper reproof.

**5.** *Servants*] **Slaves**, such as Onesimus, who was at this time being sent back to his master Philemon by St Paul.

*masters according to the flesh*] Earthly masters, whose dominion does not extend beyond the things of this world.

*with fear and trembling*] the tender timidity of love which fears to mistake in any way the will of the beloved one (Olshausen).

**6.** *eyeservice, as menpleasers*] This was the principle of the Greek and Roman slaves, and is naturally the motive on which subordinates act who have been brought up in the fear of man or of the law instead of God.

*servants of Christ*] His **slaves.**

**7.** *With good will*] The Christian slave

Digitized by Google

8 Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether *he be* bond or free.

9 And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, [1]forbearing threatening: knowing that [1]your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.

[1] Or, *moderating.*
[1] Some read, *both your and their Master.*

10 Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

11 Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

12 For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against [1]spiritual wickedness in [1]high *places.*

[1] Or, *wicked spirits.*
[1] Or, *heavenly.*

13 Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and [1]having done all, to stand.

[1] Or, *having overcome all.*

---

was to contrast in this with his fellow-slaves, of whom it was proverbially said that a man had as many enemies as he had slaves (Seneca, 'Ep.' 47).

*as to the Lord, and not to men*] Cf. George Herbert:

> "A servant with this clause
> Makes drudgery divine:
> Who sweeps a room, as for thy laws,
> Makes that and the action fine."

**8.** *the same shall he receive*] The good deed that the slave does is represented as coming back upon him, and bringing its reward from the Lord if not from the master, the law of requital at the last being the rule for slave and freeman alike. The slave's reward is defined in the Epistle to the Colossians as being a participation in the spiritual inheritance, though in the eye of the Roman law he was a chattel incapable of inheriting or possessing.

**9.** *do the same things*] Act on the same principles.

*knowing that your Master also is in heaven*] **knowing that both their and your Master is in heaven.** In these words is the handful of leaven which, spreading through the whole lump, has made slavery impossible among Christian nations.

*of persons*] Of worldly condition.

10—18. THE CHRISTIAN PANOPLY. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 8; Col. iv. 2.

**10.** *my brethren*] These words must be omitted, though they have some MS. authority.

*be strong*] Rather, "be strengthened." The pieces of armour enumerated below will be useless unless a Divine strength be imparted to wear and use them.

**11.** *the whole armour of God*] The panoply (the technical word used to describe the heavy-armed soldier's full suit of armour) which is supplied by God.

**12.** *against principalities, against powers*] The same terms being employed to distinguish different classes of fallen angels as had been previously applied to the angelic hosts (iii. 10), suggests that the same ranks and gradations exist among them as had existed before their fall. Cf. Col. ii. 15.

*against the rulers of the darkness of this world*] **against the world-wide rulers of this darkness.** Two statements are made or implied here; the first that evil spirits have a dominion co-extensive with the world or universe, whence the designation of their chief as "the ruler of this world" (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11) and "the god of this world" (2 Cor. iv. 4); the second, that their dominion is over "this darkness." This expression has probably the same signification as "the air" in ii. 2, where Satan is called "the prince of the power of the air." "The air" seems there to be contrasted with the higher, brighter, and serene heaven, and the "darkness" to be used here in contradistinction to light. Milton's idea that the evil spirits derive their name of "the power of the air" from their having passed from the darkness of hell to the light of the sun ('Par. Reg.' I. 115), has no scriptural warrant.

*spiritual wickedness*] Lit. spiritual things of wickedness, *i.e.* the hosts of wickedness, or, as given in the margin, **wicked spirits.**

*in high places*] This expression must be translated, as in the four other verses where it occurs, **in heavenly places**; and it probably means, as there, the spiritual world. By some it is taken to bear the same meaning as "the air" in ii. 2, and "this darkness" in the verse above. St Jerome says, "Not that the evil spirits reside in heaven, but the air above our heads has received this appellation."

**13.** *take unto you*] This was the technical word of command for arming, which St Paul must have been in the constant habit of hearing in its Latin form at the time that he wrote.

*in the evil day*] In the day of peril.

*having done all*] This rendering is preferable to that of the margin, "having overcome all."

Digitized by Google

14 Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;

15 And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;

16 Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

17 And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:

18 Praying always with all prayer

---

**14.** *Stand therefore,* &c.] The soldier's panoply consists first of the body-armour—namely, the girdle, the breastplate and the shoes; next the defensive arms—the shield and the helmet; and lastly the offensive weapon—the sword. This was the accoutrement which St Paul had constantly before his eyes during his two years' imprisonment. The Christian panoply, answering to that of the soldier and serving for defensive and offensive arms, is truth, righteousness, preparation, faith, salvation, the Word of God, to which is added prayer. Cf. Ignatius' Epistle to Polycarp, c. VI.

*girt about*] The girdle encircled the body below the breastplate, keeping the armour in its place and supporting the sword.

*truth*] Truthfulness—the honest uprightness that will not lie or deceive is the girdle. St Paul begins (as in iv. 25) with this quality because it is essential to the Christian character, and without it there can be no virtue, piety, religion, or righteousness. Cf. Isai. xi. 5, where the word is translated in the A.V. by "faithfulness"—"and righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins."

*the breastplate of righteousness*] The breastplate, covering the chest, was sometimes, though not always, formed of two portions. In the Epistle to the Thessalonians, written some ten years ago, St Paul had likened these two portions to faith and love (1 Thess. v. 8). Now he reserves faith for the signification of the shield, and looking on the breastplate as a single piece of armour, he finds its correlative in "righteousness," that is, the quality which, whether inwrought or imputed, or both, belongs to the man who is justified and sanctified. The idea of the breastplate being righteousness is taken from Isai. lix. 17, "He put on righteousness as a breastplate."

**15.** *the preparation of the gospel of peace*] Readiness or preparedness, which is derived from the gospel. St Paul specifies the gospel or good tidings as being the gospel "of peace," in allusion to, and partial citation of, Isai. lii. 7, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace." Olshausen happily paraphrases "preparation" by "a vigorous spiritual freedom of movement," caused, as he conceives, by the gospel of peace, because the latter removes all obstruction to the spiritual life. There may be a reference to Exod. xii. 11, xiii. 18.

**16.** *Above all*] That is, over and above all the body-armour specified.

*the shield*] There were two shields. This is the large shield which Polybius describes as four feet long and two and a half feet broad, covering therefore the whole person: it typifies the loving trust in God which protects the Christian believer from doubts and from any excessive distress.

*the fiery darts*] Military weapons known by the name of *malleoli;* they are specified because they were the most dangerous of missiles at that time invented.

**17.** *the helmet of salvation*] The image is again taken from Isai. lix. 17, "He put an helmet of salvation on his head." Already the Apostle had adopted and enlarged the idea in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, "putting on for a helmet the hope of salvation" (1 Thess. v. 8). Here he not only designates the helmet "the hope of salvation," but calls it "the helmet of salvation," salvation being to the Christian not only a hope, but in its degree a present possession. We are already in "a state of salvation."

*the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God*] The word of God (an expression used nine times in the Pauline Epistles, and not identical with the theological term "the Word," made familiar to us by the opening verses of St John's Gospel) means an utterance proceeding from God, and specially the Gospel, written or preached. It is the sword of the Spirit, both because Revelation is the work of the Spirit, and because the Word does not serve as a sword except the Spirit teach its use. To the carnal mind the written Word is a collection of ancient histories, laws, and thoughts of men, useful in their day but now suitable for the museum; it is only in the hands of the man who is enlightened by the Spirit of God that it becomes "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. iv. 12). Our Lord, in His temptation, has given us an example how the Word of God may be used as a weapon of offence as well as defence.

**18.** *Praying always*] The sword of the

Digitized by Google

and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;

19 And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel,

20 For which I am an ambassador [1] in bonds: that [1] therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.

21 But that ye also may know my affairs, *and* how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you al things:

22 Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and *that* he might comfort your hearts.

23 Peace *be* to the brethren,

[1] Or, *in a chain.*
[1] Or, *thereof.*

---

Spirit cannot be rightly wielded except by a man who is in constant communion with the Spirit by prayer. St Paul therefore cannot but refer to prayer in connexion with the word of God, though he does not name the javelin or *pilum* (as we might have expected) as its counterpart.

*in the Spirit*] "as Spiritual men," just as "in Christ" frequently means "as Christians."

*thereunto*] Unto prayer, which is to include intercessions for all their brother Christians.

19, 20. Personal Application of the Last Precept. Cf. Col. iv. 3, 4.

**19.** *And for me*] Rather, **And in my behalf**, the preposition being different from that used immediately before. St Paul is not content with a general precept of intercessory prayer, but asks specially for their intercessions in behalf of himself in his present circumstances.

*that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known*] **that when I open my mouth, I may boldly make known.**

*the mystery of the gospel*] St Paul returns with his last words to the main subject of his Epistle—the mystery that down to the present time the whole world except the Jews had been excluded from the knowledge of the good news and from the participation of the blessings of the covenant, while now that knowledge and participation were thrown open to all nations.

**20.** *For which I am an ambassador in bonds*] St Paul was the Ambassador Extraordinary sent with the message of Adoption and Reconciliation to the Gentiles, but he was at the present moment an ambassador in bonds, and it was his known attachment to Gentiles which had led to his being made a prisoner. It is thought that the expression "in bonds," more literally rendered in the margin by "in a chain," refers to the single chain by which his right arm was fastened to the soldier's left arm.

*that therein*] That is, in the matter of the Gospel mystery.

21—24. Conclusion and Final Salutation. Cf. Col. iv. 7.

**21.** *that ye also*] The word "also" admits of four explanations. 1. St Paul may mean by the "ye also" each several church to which Tychicus came in his journey as he carried the circular letter—not only Ephesians and Laodiceans, but "ye also" as well as they. 2. The "also" may have slipped from his pen in tacit reference to what he had just written in the Epistle to the Colossians. In Col. iv. 7 he tells the Colossians that Tychicus should make known to them the state that he was in: if he wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians immediately afterwards, he might very naturally have told them and the other Asiatic Christians that Tychicus should "also" inform *them* as he would inform the Colossians. 3. St Paul may mean that as he had been anxious to know of their welfare, so they "also" must be informed of his. 4. He may refer to the Roman Christians—"that ye, as well as those here, may know my affairs."

*Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord*] We first hear of Tychicus in Acts xx. 4 as accompanying St Paul as he returned from his third missionary journey, possibly in the character of a delegate of the Church of Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4) to carry alms to Jerusalem. He was with St Paul in his first imprisonment in Rome until sent by him with the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians (Col. iv. 7), and again he is with him when he wrote the Epistle to Titus (Tit. iii. 12) and during the early part of his second imprisonment (2 Tim. iv. 12). For about ten years therefore he appears to have "faithfully ministered in the Lord" to St Paul as "a beloved brother." The word "minister" is used generally not technically (cf. Acts xix. 22).

**22.** *Whom I have sent*] Probably, "Whom I send."

*comfort your hearts*] Rather, "encourage and strengthen your hearts." See iii. 13.

**23.** *to the brethren*] Note the absence of



Digitized by Google

and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

24 Grace *be* with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ [1]in sincerity. Amen.

[1] Or, *with incorruption.*

¶ Written from Rome unto the Ephesians by Tychicus.

---

individual salutations. He speaks indefinitely, in the third person, so as to include in his general farewell those whom he had not visited.

**24.** *Grace*] In all the earlier Epistles and in the Epistle to the Philippians St Paul specifies whose grace it is that he invokes, viz. that of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the later Epistles the expression has become so familiar that it can be used absolutely without fear of misunderstanding. See Col. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15. Cf. also Heb. xiii. 25.

*in sincerity*] Lit. "in incorruption." Probably it means "with an eternal and unchanging love"—a love that does not partake of the frailty or capriciousness of human love, but never fails in this life or in that which is to come. This idea is expressed in the popular hymn:

"And our love is love for ever,
For it is for Jesus' sake."

Cf. with this final prayer the warning contained in 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

*Amen*] This word should be omitted, not having the authority of the best MSS.

Digitized by Google

# PHILIPPIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



### § I. Occasion; General Character.

THIS Epistle, alone among the extant Epistles of St. Paul to the Churches, appears to have arisen out of a personal occasion. The Philippians have sent a contribution towards his support in his imprisonment. Their messenger, after a delay caused first by his zealous ministrations to the Apostle, and afterwards by a dangerous illness, is about to return to them. The Apostle takes the opportunity of sending by his hand this letter of thanks for their gift.

It bears, accordingly, a peculiarly personal character. It is the letter of a friend to his friends, rather than the Epistle of the Apostle to his disciples. The circumstances which thus led to the writing of it, though the place they occupy in it is small and inconspicuous, make themselves felt throughout it:—negatively, in the absence of definite didactic object or methodical arrangement, of all tone of authority or formal teaching; positively, in the glow of personal feeling and tender warmth of expression which pervade the whole. Everywhere, moreover, it is implied that the terms on which the writer stands with those he addresses, are of singular and reciprocal confidence and affection. We learn that, on their part, this recent gift is but the renewal after an interval, to their father in Christ, of their earlier cares for his welfare. We perceive that, on his part, the feelings elsewhere so sensitively averse to the semblance of dependence, vibrate with keen pleasure in response to the offering of his beloved Philippians. Written from a heart so moved, the Epistle naturally opens with words of thankful love,—with the acknowledgment of their helpful sympathy, and the assurance of his prayers for them. He proceeds to tell of his personal condition, and of the progress of the Gospel in the City whence he writes,—as to friends of whose concern in his welfare and his work he is fully assured. He debates the question whether of the two to prefer, life or death, as in presence of friends privileged to overhear the secret self-communings of his inmost spirit. Words of exhortation follow,—of admonition, of doctrine; but all uttered in loving solicitude, and out of his fulness of heart, with hardly anywhere a touch of blame as though aught were amiss in their life or faith. He pauses in the middle, to speak of his hope of revisiting them, of sending Timothy, of the return of Epaphroditus. The thought occurs of possible peril to their spiritual well-being from such evil influences as are rife around him as he writes (see below, § III., B, iii.), and he digresses into a stern denunciation of false teachers and corrupting examples. It is not till he draws near the close, that their bounty, though apparently present to his mind in writing the opening verses, and distinctly referred to where he speaks of Epaphroditus, is directly mentioned and duly acknowledged with thanks.

We turn to the narrative of St. Paul's earlier relations with the Philippians, to trace the origin of the mutual attachment, binding him with them more



Digitized by Google

intimately than with any of his other children in Christ, of which this Epistle is the abiding record.

## § II. Philippi and its Church.

His first visit to Philippi was a memorable one, as marking a starting point of capital importance in his apostolic course. In it he first entered on that work in Europe, which signalized his Second Missionary Journey (A.D. 50–51). Divine intimations, restraining or inviting, had shaped his course from central Asia Minor to Macedonia.[1] Neapolis,[2] by reason of its secure roadstead, was naturally the point where he first touched European soil; but Philippi, of which Neapolis may be called the port, was the place chosen to receive the first opening of his divine commission for Europe.

A. The city was well suited to be the scene of an action so momentous. It recalls the memory of the great king, Philip of Macedon, who, attracted by the commanding position of Crenidæ (then a Thracian town), and the wealth of its gold mines, seized it (B.C. 358), made it a frontier city of his kingdom, and a base for the farseeing plans of conquest afterwards carried out by his greater son,—and called it by his own name. Three centuries later, that position,—a pass in the great mountain barrier which guards Macedonia, and behind it Greece, on the north and east, dominating the highway between Asia and Europe,[3] marked it out to be the field of the decisive battle (B.C. 42), in which Brutus and Cassius, moving westward for the final struggle, encountered the eastward advance of Antony and Octavius; and by their defeat and death left Rome prostrate at the feet of the Triumvirs.

Except, however, in its associations with the beginning of the Macedonian Empire, and with the fall of the Roman Republic, Philippi was not, when the Apostle first entered it, a great city. It was "first,"[1] not in rank, but merely in topographical order, to one entering Macedonia from the east. But what it lacked of individual importance was more than compensated by its representative character. It stood on Grecian soil; the language, usages, and religion of its population were Greek;[2] its origin and its rise belong to the history of Greece. Again, it was a Roman Colony,—raised to that rank by Augustus, to be at once an outpost of the Roman province and a monument of the victory that made him lord of the Roman world; planted with a Roman settlement, of the remnant of the Antonian party;[3] strategically, a Roman garrison; in political constitution, a "miniature Rome." Though not itself a centre of commerce or of manufacture, it was a station on the Great Egnatian Way, and through it passed, eastward and westward, traders from all parts of the empire. Combining thus the two main constituents of European life, giving entrance to every element that Europe drew to itself from the wider life without, it was in all points a typical city of Europe,[4] it

[1] Acts xvi. 6–10.

[2] *Ib.* 11; xx. 6,—and notes. Now Cavallo; not Eski Cavallo, as Cousinéry thought. (Lewin, 'St. Paul,' I., xi.). "It was the invariable landing-place for travellers bound for the *Via Egnatia.*" (*ib.*). As a port it still retains something of its old importance. "[Bulgaria], which under the treaty [of S.Stefano] extends to the Ægean . . . requires very material reduction. It is essential that Salonica *and Cavalla* should be kept at a distance from the jurisdiction of any state likely to fall under the influence of Russia." (Marquis of Salisbury, 'Blue Book,' *Turkey*, No. 39 (1878), *Correspondence relating to the Congress of Berlin*, No. 3). It was the birthplace of Mehemet Ali, first hereditary Pasha of Egypt. (Tozer, 'Highlands of Turkey,' III.)

[3] τὸ δὲ μέσον . . . τῶν λόφων δίοδος ἦν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν τε καὶ Εὐρώπην καθάπερ πύλαι. (Appian, 'B.C.', IV. 650.)

[1] Acts xvi. 12;—see note there.

[2] "The Macedonians certainly appear an essentially Greek people in all material respects, at the epoch of their political ascendency." (Mure, 'Antient Greece,' I., iii., § 9.) See Müller, 'Dorians,' Introd., 3; Appx. I., 'The Macedonians,' §§ 29–36 (Tufnell and Lewis's Transl.). Cp. Herodot., VIII., 137, 138.

[3] Dion Cassius, 'H. R.,' LI., 4.

[4] See first note on Acts xvi. 12.—"Cette ville grecque repeuplée de Romains, est comme le symbole de l'état social de l'Occident à cette époque . . . La société païenne en Europe est représentée dans Philippes d'une manière tout à fait générale." (Rilliet, Introd. to 'Philippians.')—"A Roman colony in Greece an epitome of the Gentile world." (Bp. Wordsworth, Introd. to Philippians, IV.)—"That

Digitized by Google

offered itself as a fit station for the planting of the Standard,—first raised in the East, but destined to have in the West its greatest and abiding triumphs, —of Him Whose Kingdom was to rise in the ruins of the kingdoms of this world, itself to stand for ever.[1]

B. 1. The circumstances, however, which attended the event, were, in the commencement, of the simplest. On the first Sabbath[2] of his sojourn the Apostle, with Timothy, Silas, and Luke, "sat down and spake unto the women," —representing the Jewish community of the city,—whom they found congregated at a Proseucha (or place of prayer), outside the gates, by the riverside,—too few, it seems, to have a Synagogue. One of these, Lydia, Asian by birth, and no doubt a proselytess, with ready faith believed, was baptized with her family, and opened her house to the bearers of the glad tidings. A space, we are not told how long, of quiet progress ensued; brought to a sudden and violent close by circumstances of singular and supernatural import. By casting out the "spirit of Python" from the soothsaying damsel,[3] who recognized in the apostolic band "the servants of the Most High God," St. Paul drew down on himself and Silas an angry outcry from her owners, enraged at the loss of their slave's gift on which they traded; followed by a burst of popular frenzy, and an illegal and cruel outrage on the part of the Duumvirs of the city, who scourged them and flung them into prison. The same night an earthquake opened the prison doors, and moved their jailor to seek of them the knowledge of salvation, and to receive baptism for himself and all his. Next day, at the request of the alarmed magistrates, they left the city.

The work was thus ended abruptly, yet not in failure. The Church of Philippi, firstborn of the Churches of Europe, has come into being. In the house of Lydia, where the Apostle took his leave of "the brethren,"[1] that Church has found a local habitation. Distinct nationalities, widely different ranks and callings, are represented in the first recorded converts;—the purple-dealer from Asia,—the divining slave-girl, apparently a Greek,—the Roman jailor. The soldiers of the Cross have for the first time come into collision with the frenzy of Greek superstition, for the first time encountered the rigour of the persecuting Roman; but have lived to give thanks for victory. Christian hospitality,—the Christian household,—the equal rights of woman with man in Christian faith and work,—the reception of the slave into the Christian covenant, —all these characteristics, destined to be developed in the future Church of Christ, and to renew the social state of mankind, show themselves definitely in the brief yet full record of the beginnings of the Philippian Church given by St. Luke.[2] As the city was a representative of European cities, so in the narrative of the foundation of its Church do we seem to discern by anticipation and in germ, the history of the fortunes, the influences, and the achievements, of the after ages of the Universal Church in the Empire which had its centre in Europe, but in its compass included the world.[3]

2. Several years elapsed before St. Paul returned to Philippi. But our Epistle testifies (iv. 15, 16) that before he was many months, or even weeks, gone from among them, they pursued

Colony, which was more fit than any other in the Empire to be considered the representative of Imperial Rome." (Dean Howson, 'Life, &c., of St. Paul,' IX.)—See also Bp. Lightfoot, 'Philippians' (Introd., III., pp. 48-52).

[1] Dan. ii. 44.—Concerning Philippi, see the copious details given by Dean Howson, as above.

[2] Acts xvi. 13 and sqq.; see notes there.

[3] Acts xvi. 16.—She may have belonged to some local oracle of Apollo [*Pythius*], whose worship, prevalent in Macedonia from early times, was probably introduced from *Pythium* on Mt. Olympus. (See Müller, 'Dorians,' II., i., § 2, and Appx. I., § 33.)—Or perhaps (as some suppose) of Dionysus, whose oracle among the Satrae, with its prophets (Bessi), and chief prophetess, appears to have been situated on a hill (λόφος Διονύσου) close to Philippi. (Cp. Herodot., VII., 111, 112, with Appian, as above.)

[1] Acts xvi. 40.

[2] See these points brought out with much power by Bp. Lightfoot, Introd., III., 2, pp. 52-57.

[3] "Thus the city vindicated its original name (*Crenides* = Fountains) in a higher sense, for the entire West." (Meyer, Introd. to Philipp., § 1.)

Digitized by Google

him, "once and again," with the tokens of their attachment, while he was yet "in Thessalonica" (the next city he visited),—and yet again "when he departed from Macedonia." And when we compare his assertion in the passage referred to,—that from no other Church did he in those early days of the Gospel accept sustenance save only from the Philippians,—with the fact stated in another Epistle, that "brethren coming *from Macedonia* supplied" his wants in Corinth during his first sojourn there, we are led to infer that by these brethren's hands his Philippian friends once more renewed to him, after he had passed from Macedonia to Achaia, the kindness that had followed him to Thessalonica.[1]

3. When in the course of his Third Missionary Journey the Apostle travelled (57) through the cities of Macedonia,[2] we may be sure that he visited Philippi with the rest,—probably, as in his previous journey, before the rest. With the rest, Philippi was then passing through the "affliction,"[3]—persecution apparently,—which at that time lay heavy on the Macedonian Churches, as recorded in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, written during this visit to Macedonia.[4] And with the rest no doubt, —nay, we may well conjecture, beyond the rest, the Philippians, in answer to his appeal on behalf of the poor brethren of Jerusalem, abounded with the same ready bounty as had prompted their gifts to himself.

4. Early in the next year (58), on his return from Achaia to Judea, he passed through Macedonia to Philippi. There, letting his other companions "go before," he spent the Paschal season[5] along with St. Luke—who now reappears as his companion for the first time since he (as it seems) remained behind at the close of the first visit to Philippi;[6] left there, it may be, in charge of the newly founded Macedonian Churches. Thus of these two Missionary Journeys in Europe, the latter ends where the former began—at Philippi.

[1] Cp. Acts xvii. 1, 14, and xviii. 1–18, and 2 Cor. xi. 9, with Philipp. iv. 15, 16,—on which latter verses see below notes and reference to Paley, 'H.P.'

[2] Acts xx. 1, 2.

[3] 2 Cor. viii. 1, 2.

[4] See Introd. to 2 Cor., II.

[5] Acts xx. 3–6.

[6] *Ib.* xx. 5 ("*these*," "*us*"), 6 ("*we*," "*they*"). See note there, and on xvi. 10 ("*we*"), 40 ("*they*").

5. From this point Philippi disappears from the narrative of the Acts, and we know its Church only by the glimpses of its interior disclosed in our Epistle. We see it as an organized community, with a regular Ministry (i. 1). We are informed that the care of its members for its founder, interrupted for a while by lack of means, had been renewed in the mission of Epaphroditus (ii. 25; iv. 10–18). We gather that they were suffering persecution for Christ's sake (i. 27–30). We learn that discord existed between two of their chief women (iv. 2, 3). In the earnest and repeated inculcation of the duty of unity (i. 27; ii. 2, &c.), we seem to have evidence that among them there was a tendency to division. Otherwise, there is no trace of moral fault to be rebuked; nor is there anywhere a hint of doctrinal error. There is nothing in them to mar the thankful joy with which their father in Christ dwells on the contemplation of their faith and love.

6. How or when he again revisited them, according to his purpose declared in this Epistle (i. 25–27; ii. 24), we are not directly informed. But that he fulfilled that purpose, we infer from the mention of his journey "into Macedonia," in the First Epistle to Timothy (i. 3).

C. The subsequent history of Philippi is wellnigh a blank. We know that the Philippians of a later day, early in the second century, extended to St. Ignatius when he passed through their city on his way to his martyrdom at Rome, the same sympathizing care as St. Paul had received from their fathers.[1] We gain some little insight into their condition from the Epistle addressed to them soon after by St. Polycarp of Smyrna. Except in the matter of one erring presbyter, all indicates that they were, as those to whom St. Paul writes, full of faith and the fruits of

[1] 'Martyr. S. Ign.,' V.; Polyc. 'Ad Philipp.,' I., IX., XIII.

Digitized by Google

faith.[1]—In after ages the city long continued to be the seat of a Bishop, and even ranked as a Metropolis.[2] But now it survives only in the title of the "Bishop of Drama *and Philippi*," and in the ruins known as Felibah.[3] Nothing of it is left but a fragment of its walls, an echo of its name.—And when from these scanty notices, so obscure and brief, ending in the total disappearance of this Church from the pages of history, we turn back to St. Luke's vivid narrative of its origin, with all its signal and miraculous circumstances, and to the Epistle which records the joyful promise of its early days, we are confirmed in the conclusion that the conspicuous place given to it in the annals of the rise and progress of the Kingdom of Christ, is due rather to the surpassing importance of that which Philippi typically embodied, as representing imperial Europe, than to what in itself it was,—or was to be.

§ III. Place and Time of writing.

A. That our Epistle was written from Rome, is plain on its surface.[4] The writer speaks of himself as one in "bonds;" tells how the knowledge of his case has pervaded "the Prætorium"; conveys the salutations of them "that are of Cæsar's household" (i. 13; 16; iv. 22). The internal indications all agree with the received account,—that it was written in the course of the imprisonment recorded in the last chapter of the Acts, beginning in 61.

B. Assuming that St. Paul was released in 63,[5] we have the date of the Epistle fixed within narrow limits.

[1] Polyc., *ib.*, XI., XII.

[2] Originally suffragan to Thessalonica, it became, in the division of the province made by the younger Theodosius, Metropolis of "Macedonia *Prima*," with seven suffragan sees. The Bishop of Drama and Philippi is still entitled Metropolitan. (Neale, 'Holy Eastern Church,' Gen. Introd. (Appx.), pt. 1, p. 92; pt. 2, p. 9.)

[3] Or Filibedjik. (Heuzey, *ap.* Renan, 'St. Paul,' VI.)

[4] The suggestion, that Cæsarea was the place of writing (Paulus, &c.), is hardly possible. Oeder's, that it was Corinth, is out of the question. See Olshausen and Wiesinger, Introd. to Philipp., § 3.

[5] See Acts, Introd., § 3, p. 321; and note on xxviii. 30.

Whether it was written in the earlier or in the later days of his captivity,—whether before or after the three other Epistles (Ephes., Coloss., and Philem.) which belong to the same period,—are questions which we have not materials for answering with certainty.

i. On the side of the later date the following considerations have weight:—

(1). To the Ephesians he writes of himself as being still free to preach the Gospel, as we see him in the closing verses of the Acts:[1] while our Epistle, in which he speaks of the Gospel as preached by others, or by the silent witness of his bonds (i. 12–14), indicates an increase of the rigour of his prison. He even writes as one in face of an impending crisis, threatened with death, undergoing a "conflict" (i. 20–30; ii. 17, 23). It has been conjectured that the death, in the second year of his imprisonment (62), of the upright Burrus, to whose custody as Prætorian Præfect[2] he had been committed,—and the appointment to that office of the infamous Tigellinus,[3] may have been the cause of this change for the worse in his condition.

(2). The prospect, however, of a favourable issue of this crisis,—that his appeal will soon be heard and will result in his release, seems more definitely present to his mind when he writes to the Philippians (i. 25; ii. 24), "I *know* I shall continue with you, "I *trust* I shall come shortly,"—than when to Philemon, "I *hope* I shall be given to you."[4]

(3). When he wrote to the Colossians and to Philemon, Luke and Aristarchus, who had accompanied him to Rome, were still with him.[5] Neither is named in our Epistle. The absen · of their names does not, of course, of itself prove that they had left him before it was written. But as regards St. Luke at least, if he had been with St. Paul as he wrote, it is highly improbable that he would have omitted to send a greeting to a Church with which he had been so intimately associated (see above, § II., B,

[1] Eph. vi. 19, 20; Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

[2] "Captain of the Guard," Acts xxviii. 16.

[3] Tacitus, 'Annal.,' XIV., 51.

[4] Philem. 22 (ἐλπίζω),—not, as A.V., "I *trust*."

[5] Acts xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24.

Digitized by Google

1, 4): and it is impossible to suppose that the Apostle would have failed to except him when he complained that of his companions *none* was "like-minded" with Timothy, that "*all* sought their own, not the things of Jesus Christ" (ii. 20, 21).

These are comparative tokens of a later date: the following are positive.

(4). The progress made by the Gospel in Rome as shown in our Epistle, and the notoriety which he and his case had attained (i. 12–18), require us to allow a considerable time for his sojourn in the city before he wrote.

(5). A long time is likewise implied in what we read of Epaphroditus. Tidings of St. Paul's imprisonment have passed from Rome to Philippi: a sum of money has been collected by the Philippians: Epaphroditus has conveyed it from Philippi to Rome: he has sojourned there as the Apostle's companion and helper: he has had, and recovered from, a dangerous illness: the account of that illness has been carried to Philippi from Rome: and the expression of their concern has reached him at Rome from Philippi[1] (iv. 10, 14, 18; ii. 25–27).

On these and like grounds the Epistle has usually, and as it appears rightly, been reckoned as latest in order of the "Epistles of the [first Roman] Captivity," written probably early[2] in 63,—his "farewell Epistle to the Gentile Churches."[3]

ii. The contrary opinion, however, has never been without supporters, and has recently been maintained by Bp. Lightfoot.[4] He observes that our Epistle, "in style and tone, as well as in its prominent ideas, bears a much greater resemblance to the earlier letters than do the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians." He dwells especially on its close affinity to the Epistle to the Romans (which on this theory it immediately follows in order of time), evidenced by a copious list of parallels and verbal coincidences. And he concludes that, while our Epistle is to be assigned to "as early a date as circumstances will allow," the other two, as "exhibiting an advanced stage in the development of the Church," are to be "placed as late as possible."

iii. That the affinity thus indicated exists,—that the thoughts, and (still more) the diction of our Epistle connect it rather with that to the Romans than with those to the Ephesians and Colossians,—is unquestionable. But this fact is hardly a secure basis for a chronological argument. The Epistle to the Romans was written early in 58, not less than three years before it;—the other two cannot be placed more than two years after it. The resemblance, therefore, borne by it to the former rather than to the latter can hardly be due to proximity of date. Besides, it is not to be assumed that the Apostle, in the later developments of his teaching, had finally parted from its earlier themes. Though we find that in addressing those Asian Churches, he adopted a manner and matter (due no doubt to their special circumstances) different from what we meet with in his previous Epistles, to Rome or Corinth, we have in that fact absolutely nothing to make it improbable that, in writing at the same or a later time to the Philippians, he would revert, on occasion, to the topics—or even, if circumstances suggested them, to the phrases, of those earlier writings.[1] The style and tone of a letter are not more likely to be determined by the period of the writer's life to which it belongs, than by his sense of the requirements of those whom he addresses, or by the circumstances which surround him as he writes. Bp. Lightfoot himself regards it as probable that the warning against Judaizing error, so abruptly introduced in the middle of our Epistle (iii. 2 and sqq.) was prompted by "some fresh attempt of the Judaizers *in the Metropolis*."[2] And it is observable that most of the verbal, and all the

[1] See Paley, 'H.P.', VII., i., v.

[2] Some see a trace of *spring* in the expression "ye *flourished again*," iv. 10,—where see note. The previous *autumn* ("auctumnus gravis, Libitinæ quæstus acerbæ,"—Hor., 'Sat.,' II. vi. 19) may have caused the illness of Epaphroditus.

[3] Bp. Wordsworth, Introd., IV

[4] Introd., II., pp. 40-45.

[1] At the same time it is to be observed that the great truths of the Resurrection and Exaltation of Christ are in our Epistle treated in a manner fully harmonizing with what we read in Eph. and Col.—Cp. ii. 6–11, and iii. 20, 21, with Eph. i. 10, 19–22, and Col. iii. 1–4.

[2] Introd., IV., p. 68; also note on iii. 2.

Digitized by Google

doctrinal, points of contact between it and the Epistle to the Romans, occur in the digression which begins with the warning in question, and occupies the third chapter. The state of things at Rome, of which the Apostle's mind was full when he wrote the early part of our Epistle (i. 12–18—see § IV. A), is naturally reflected in the tenour of its doctrinal contents. And hence it comes to pass that the Epistle which, a few years before, he had addressed to the Roman Christians, containing in its fullest form the teaching which their condition required, reproduces itself, here and there, in the theology,—in the very language,—of an Epistle written from Rome, out of a heart to which the circumstances of the Roman Church are vividly present.

## § IV. Contents.

A. Of the contents of the Epistle, so far as they are *personal*, a brief outline has been given above, in § I. Some parts of them have been stated in more detail;—such as disclose the circumstances of the Philippians, in § II., B, 5, —such as relate to the Apostle and his surroundings, in § III., B, i. It is to be observed that in no other Epistle does he speak so fully of the condition of the Church in the place where he writes, or of the persons who are about him (i. 12–18; ii. 20–30).

B. That its *didactic* contents occupy a secondary place, follows from the fact that its character is mainly personal,—the writer's purpose being to thank benefactors rather than to exhort disciples.

1. The doctrinal element in it is limited in extent and incidental in the manner of its introduction. Thus it has been called, and in this respect justly, "the least dogmatic of the Apostle's letters." [1] But its assertions of doctrine, though brief and neither many nor direct, are in a true and highly important sense eminently dogmatic. In it the fundamental positions of the Gospel are not expounded as lessons, nor maintained by argument or evidence: they are simply declared as known truths, or implied as the received bases of the Christian faith and life.

[1] Bp. Lightfoot, Preface, p. vii.

The truths so assumed comprise the main articles of the Christian creed. In one famous passage (ii. 6–11), we have the Godhead of Christ and His Manhood,—His Pre-existence and His Incarnation,—His Passion and His Exaltation: elsewhere (iii. 10, 20, 21; iv. 5; i. 19; ii. 1), the quickening power of His Resurrection-Life, its ultimate triumph over Death, His Second Advent;—the Church as the City of God; the gift of the Spirit. The special teachings of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians—the passing away of the Law, Justification by Faith—are distinctly and fully, if not prominently, affirmed (iii. 7–9).

2. In its hortatory aspect, the graces in which it most dwells are, unity among brethren (i. 27; ii. 2, &c.), and inward joy (ii. 18; iii. 1; iv. 4). Humility and unselfishness are commended,—forbearance, resignation, thankfulness, and prayer (ii. 3, 4; iv. 5, 6). To this specially Christian realm, a single verse (iv. 8) annexes wellnigh the whole domain of truths contained in Gentile philosophy and religion.[1]

3. One negative fact is worthy of notice. The Old Testament is nowhere expressly appealed to in our Epistle; and while references to it more or less distinct, appear in a few places (i. 19; ii. 10, 11; *ib.* 15; iv. 18), actual citations of it are absolutely wanting.[2]

4. Viewed as a whole, the Epistle possesses a breadth and comprehensiveness of teaching, moral and doctrinal, which are peculiar to it. As has been well said, it "exhibits the normal type of the Apostle's teaching"[3] This is

[1] See below, notes on this verse.—To its ethical completeness, Macaulay has paid tribute in a singular form. After depicting the character of an all-evil man, he sums up thus,—"Whatsoever things are false, whatsoever things are dishonest, whatsoever things are unjust, whatsoever things are impure, whatsoever things are hateful, whatsoever things are of evil report, if there be any vice, and if there be any infamy, all these things were blended in Barère." ('Edinb. Rev.,' Apr. 1844.)

[2] The same is true of the Epp. to two other mainly Gentile Churches,—the Colossian, and Thessalonian:—also of that to Philemon.

[3] Bp. Lightfoot, as above.

Digitized by Google

due to the fact that, writing here not to rebuke special existing errors,—moral (as at Corinth) or doctrinal (as among the Galatians)—but to exhort and edify the faithful, he is not led to dwell mainly on any one aspect of the Gospel; but presents it in its fulness, and "according to the proportion of faith."

C. How closely its contents correspond with what we gather from other documents, of the circumstances of the writer and of the receivers, will appear from consideration of the following points.

He speaks of the rights and duties of citizens (i. 27; iii. 20),[1]—suitably, in addressing men who enjoyed the Roman *citizenship.* The whole conception of their position towards their "adversaries," which he illustrates by that of men united in defence of a beleaguered fortress (i. 27, 28; iv. 1 and sqq.),[2] seems suggested by the *military* character of a Roman Colony. They were in the main a *Gentile* community, with no considerable infusion of Jewish element; and accordingly the Epistle contains no express citation of the Jewish Scriptures, no reference to the actual presence among them of Judaizing error:[3] —but we find the language of ethnic thought, philosophic, moral, and religious, employed in it with unusual freedom.[4] That he reminds them of "the beginning [the early days] of the Gospel" (iv. 15), accords well with the fact that theirs was the *first city* of Europe in which he preached it. That *Timothy* was with him when he came among them, is implied in the words (ii. 22), "Ye know the proof of him that . . . he served with me towards the Gospel." Their knowledge as eyewitnesses of the *suffering and peril* in which that first visit ended, is directly appealed to in the mention of "the conflict which ye saw in me" (i. 30), and perhaps also in what he says of the women who "strove along with" him (iv. 2, 3). This reminiscence of the past borne by these women, and the importance attached to their position in the Church, reminds us how at Philippi *women* were the first hearers of the Word, and under a woman's roof the Church found its first home.[1] In her generous *hospitality* was opened, as it seems, that "account of giving and receiving" which, as our Epistle attests (iv. 15, 16), from first to last subsisted between the Apostle and this Church alone of all his Churches. Above (§ II., B, 2) it has been shewn how his acknowledgment of *their gifts*, sent to him while he was still at Thessalonica, and on his departure from Macedonia, corresponds both with the narrative in the Acts of the course of his first European journey, and with what we learn from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians of his means of subsistence in their city. It is to be added, that the "deep *poverty*" which in that Epistle he attributes to the Macedonian Christians, explains the "lack of means" by which, in writing to the Philippians (iv. 10),[2] he accounts for the delay of their bounty. *His acceptance* of that bounty,—at first sight inconsistent[3] with the self-relying spirit of him who reminded the Thessalonian and Ephesian Churches of the labours of his hands for his own livelihood—who repelled the thought of being "burdensome to" the Corinthians,[4]—is distinctly stated to be an exceptional mark, granted to no other Church, of his affectionate relations with the Philippians; and thus (the exception proving the rule) confirms by implication what he elsewhere declares of his habitual independence, and shews his apostolic dignity maintained in integrity no less full here in receiving

[1] "Live as *citizens;*" "our *city,*" or "*citizenship,*"—(see notes).

[2] See notes. The words *συναθλεῖν, συστρατιώτης, φρουρεῖν* (i. 27; ii. 25; iv. 7) are military.

[3] See notes on i. 18, 28; iii. 2.

[4] Besides the ethical and sacred words of iv. 8, observe the following (all in N. T. rare, some unique),—*αἴσθησις, μορφή* and derivatives, *ἐπιεικής, αὐτάρκης, ἐνάρχεσθαι, σπένδεσθαι, μυεῖσθαι.*

[1] On the social importance of women in Macedonia, see Bp. Lightfoot, Introd., III. 2, pp. 54–56. Cp. Acts xvii. 4, 12.

[2] *Ἠκαιρεῖσθε,*—see note on the word.—When St. Paul wrote to them, they were undergoing *persecution* (i. 27–30); and so in the passage of 2 Cor. above referred to (viii. 1, 2), written five or six years before, he speaks of the "trial of affliction" of the "churches of Macedonia."

[3] This is so alleged by Baur, 'Paulus, Apost. Jesu Chr.'

[4] 1 Thess. ii. 9; Acts xx. 34; 2 Cor. xi. 9; xii. 13, 14;—cp. 1 Cor. ix. 12—18.

Digitized by Google

than there in rejecting a benefit. Similarly, the spirit of *joy* that shines out everywhere throughout our Epistle (i. 4, &c.), though it may seem alien from the state of one in prison and peril, is truly characteristic of him who, as he lay in the Philippian dungeon, bleeding from the lictors' rods, could "sing praises unto God,"[1]—who elsewhere describes himself as "sorrowful yet alway rejoicing:"[2]—it is the elastic reaction of a spirit rising in enthusiastic faith against pain and fear. Another marked feature of the Epistle is the strong *mutual attachment* implied throughout. It is expressed in endearing words,—he "has them in his heart," he "longs after them in the bowels of Jesus Christ" (i. 7, 8),—they are his "dearly beloved," "longed for," his "joy and crown" (iv. 1); it utters itself in the confidential tone of the outpourings of his inmost desires and feelings, his most sacred aspirations,—a confidence possible only within the bonds of a tender and hallowed friendship (i. 18–24); it is proved by his readiness for their sakes to part with Epaphroditus, even with Timothy (ii. 19–23, 25–30); it inspires his eager yearning for tidings of them, his undoubting assurance that they pray for him, that they long for his return to them,—that they sympathize in his welfare and his mission, in his sorrows and his joy (ii. 18–20; i. 12–19; 25, 26). All this is obviously in full harmony with the accompanying and antecedent circumstances. He received their gifts gladly, he poured out his soul to them freely, because he felt that they were at one with him in faith and holiness, because he knew and reciprocated their love. It was natural that he should love those who were to him the firstfruits of Europe, —who had shared his dangers,—who were so prompt and so persevering in following the open-hearted example of Lydia,—who were after his own heart in unreproved soundness of doctrine and purity of life. Their remote frontier city, aloof from the great centres of imperial profusion and heathen philosophy—fit seed-plots of vice and heresy, —offered a happy soil for the growth of manly virtue and of simple faith. The Macedonian character, strong, upright and generous, here as at Thessalonica and elsewhere,[1] commended itself to the Apostle's sympathies.[2] "Lo," exclaims St. Chrysostom, "what a yearning he has after Macedonia!"[3] Of such material, strengthened by the healthy and congenial infusion of a Roman[4] military element, free from the hostile influences of the Synagogue, renewed by the Gospel of Christ, was the Church formed that held the highest place in St. Paul's affection. A circumstance, inferred from an incidental notice in the Acts, is worth pointing out as singularly and touchingly characteristic of an attachment so grounded. When at the end of his Third Journey, he sent the rest of his company on before, and tarried in Macedonia with St. Luke to keep the Passover, Philippi was the place of sojourn that he chose for that holy season (§ II., B, 4). We may safely conclude that there, in a Gentile city, he kept it not as a Jewish festival, but as the Christian Easter,—kept it along with the "beloved physician," in the congenial atmosphere of the faith and love of his "beloved" Philippians.

Finally it is to be observed that, in a *general* way, a certain correspondence exists between the Epistle and the city which received it. As we have seen (§ II., A) how the circumstances of the city make it a typical city of the Empire, so has it been shewn (§ IV., B, 4) that the contents of the Epistle are those of a typical Epistle to a Church representative of the Church Universal. The City embodies the general aspect of European life in its complex conditions: the Epistle, with equal generality, sets forth the teaching of the Gospel in its fullest comprehension, as applied to renew and sanctify that life.[5]

D. In comparing our Epistle with the

[1] Acts xvi. 25.
[2] 2 Cor. vi. 10.

[1] 1 Thess. i. 1–8; ii. 19, 20; iii. 6; iv. 9, 10; 2 Cor. viii. 1–5.
[2] "[La Macédoine] était peut-être la région la plus honnête, la plus sérieuse, la plus saine, du monde antique." (Renan, 'St. Paul,' V., p. 136.) Cp. Hieron., 'Comm. in Gal.,' cited below, Introd. to 1 Thess., II. 5 (*b*), note 1.
[3] On Philipp. ii. 19,—*Hom.* IX. 1.
[4] "Les Macédoniens furent le peuple de l'antiquité qui ressembla le plus aux Romains." (Renan, as above, p. 137.)
[5] See Bp. Wordsworth, Introd., IV.

Digitized by Google

others left to us by the same hand, we find in many of them points of contact and resemblance. Its doctrinal relations with the group of Epistles written about the years 57, 58, and especially its verbal coincidences with that to the Romans, have been already discussed (§ III., B, ii., iii.). In the same portion of our Epistle (iii. 2—iv. 1) to which these belong, we are reminded of that to the Galatians by the harsh terms he applies to his Jewish adversaries[1]; the summary of his own privileges as a Jew has its parallel in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians;[2] while the First exhibits the great prototype of the passage in which he rises from the protest against Antinomian abuses into the sublime thought of the Resurrection-Body, and returns from it to the practical duty of Christian stedfastness.[3] In another point of view, the Second to the Corinthians, strongly as its outpouring of wounded feeling contrasts with the endearing language of love and confidence which mark *this*, is more closely than any of the rest akin to it, as being a revelation of the inner self of the writer.[4] In its general outline, however,—its irregular structure, its informality, its warmth of tenderness,—the nearest likeness to our Epistle is to be found in the Epistle which of all is farthest from it in order of time,—the First of the two addressed to the sister Macedonian Church of Thessalonica, only second to that of Philippi in his love.—On the other hand its contemporaneous Epistles, those to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, resemble it not at all in general character, in inner detail only here and there.[5] But in one of the subsequent Epistles (no doubt the last of them), the Second to Timothy, occurs a passage not merely parallel to certain sentences of this, but apparently written with express retrospective reference to them.[6]—With Timothy at his side, in the days of his first imprisonment, he has written from Rome to the Philippians of his desire "to *depart*," his "*fight*," his willingness to be "*poured out*" (i. 23; *ib.* 30; ii. 17);[1]—of himself as one "*pressing on*" in a *race*, for a "*prize*" (iii. 14). To Timothy, after the lapse of years, he writes as his second and final imprisonment in Rome draws towards its close, reminding him (as it seems) of that early anticipation of the end now imminent, and reverts to the same words,[2]—"I am now being *poured out*, and the time of my *departure* is at hand. I have fought the good *fight*, I have finished the *race* . . . There is laid up for me the *crown* of righteousness."

E. As regards literary form, it is of all the Epistles of St. Paul, excepting only that to Philemon, the most epistolary in its style and substance. Though it does not vie with the dialectic force, or the sustained majesty of rhetoric, displayed in others of more formal construction, it has its own proper beauties, of the rarest order,—a touching eloquence of the full heart, a delicacy of feeling and of expression, nowhere surpassed.[3] Nor when it rises to the highest of divine themes, does it fall short of giving them worthy utterance. Our Church in Advent can find no more heart-stirring voice to herald the approach of the Nativity, than its "Rejoice in the Lord alway."

[1] iii. 2 (κύνες, κατατομή); cp. Gal. v. 12, 15 (δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, ἀποκόψονται).

[2] iii. 4–6; cp. 2 Cor. xi. 21, 22.

[3] iii. 17—iv. 1; cp. 1 Cor. xv. 32–58.

[4] See Paley's comparison ('H.P.', VII., vi.) of i. 20-23, with 2 Cor. iv. 8—v. 8.

[5] See § III., B, iii., n. 1—A few verbal parallels are given below, *Suppl. Note*, I. (2) *b*.

[6] See Bp. Wordsworth, Introd., IV.

[1] ἀναλῦσαι, ἀγών, σπένδομαι.

[2] 2 Tim. iv. 6–8 (σπένδομαι, ἀνάλυσις, ἀγών). Of these three words, the first occurs in N. T. only in these two places; the second only here, and its cognate verb (in this sense of *departing*) only as above; the third is an infrequent and exclusively Pauline word.

[3] Baur speaks of it as "dull and uninteresting," "without *motif*" (*unmotivirt*), "a feeble and lifeless copy" (*Nachbild*),—of its "monotonous repetitions," and "poverty of thought" (*Gedankenarmuth*). ('Paulus, Apost. J. C.').—So complete is the power of arrogant prejudice in an irreverent mind, to blunt the literary discernment of the critic!—A worthier estimate is that of Meyer. "A letter of the heart (*des Gemüthes*), an outflow of the moment, from the inmost need of loving fellowship under outward abandonment and tribulation;—a model of the union of tender love and the impress, at times almost elegiac, of resignation in view of death, with high apostolic dignity, unbroken holy joy, hope, and victory over the world!" (Introd., § 2.)

Digitized by Google

With its sublime exposition of "the mind that was in Christ Jesus," of the infinite Self-sacrifice and the supreme Exaltation, she opens the week that commemorates His Passion.[1] In proclaiming over her dead the "sure and certain hope," she draws from it the words that testify of the glorious "change" and the almighty "working." And from it come, in the power of their calm beauty, the accents of solemn blessing in which, at the close of her most sacred Ordinance, she invokes "the peace of God" on the "hearts and minds" of her faithful children.

### § V. Genuineness and Integrity.

A. Of the *Genuineness* of the Epistle, there is no room for doubt.

i. That St. Paul is the author, the *internal* evidence of its contents, diction, and general character, proves conclusively.

1. As regards its contents, it is to be observed that it enters more fully into personal particulars touching the writer and his readers, than any other of the Epistles that bear his name. Yet in these particulars there is to be traced (as shewn in detail above, § IV., C), a correspondence with the facts of the history, as we collect them from other sources, full and deep,—if not always obvious, all the more certainly, therefore, undesigned.[2]

2. As regards diction, the evidence yielded by it is abundant and valuable. It is full of words and expressions characteristically, many of them exclusively, Pauline—most of them serving to connect it with the "unquestioned"[3] Epistles; all employed so naturally as to preclude all surmise that in them we have the workmanship of a forger, cunning in literary mosaic. That the relation thus established is not the artificially produced similarity of a counterfeit, appears again in the fact that it has, moreover, a vocabulary of its own, proper to its well-marked individual character. It contains many words nowhere found in his other writings, which an imitator would therefore have avoided.[1]

3. But greater far than these tokens of genuineness, is that which underlies them:—the solid and irrefragable evidence contained in the ideas, the feelings, the aspirations, of which our Epistle is the vehicle, and which no one who has in any degree entered into the mind of St. Paul, can doubt to be his. For a forger successfully to assume his language, and to imagine his circumstances, would be a difficult effort of historic and literary skill. But that such a one could so personate that unique individuality,—think his thoughts, speak out of his heart, —is inconceivable.

4. The attempt to discredit it as spurious may be said to have originated with Baur;[2] and has wellnigh ended with him. He regards it as a pious fraud of a later but early age, designed to reconcile the "Petrine" and "Pauline" factions. This view has found little acceptance even in his own school, and its futility is now generally admitted.[3] A critic of the highest acumen and of the freest school (M. Renan), pronounces the genuineness to be "certain."[4] Baur's objections, as founded on its style and tone, have been touched on above (§ IV., E, note [5]).—Its diction and contents, where they resemble those of the "unquestioned" Epistles, betray to him the work of the imitator;[5] where they seem unlike,

[1] Epp. for 4th Sunday in Advent, and for Sunday next before Easter. So in Sarum Offices.

[2] Read Paley 'H.P.', VII. Some of the coincidences developed by him are noted above; but the whole chapter deserves careful study.

[3] Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Galat.

[1] See below, *Suppl. Note*, where the relation of the diction of this Ep. to that of the other Pauline documents, is shewn in detail.

[2] 'Paulus, Ap. J. C.' Bp. Lightfoot, Introd., p. 73, refers to Evanson ('Dissonance,' &c.) as the first to impugn its authorship.

[3] Schwegler, 'Nachapost. Zeitalt.' (quoted by Wiesinger, Introd., § 4, 1) adopts Baur's view, pushing it so far as to regard Euodia and Syntyche (iv. 2) as the names not of persons but of parties, the Jewish-Christian and the Gentile-Christian, in the Church!—Holsten ('Jahrbuch f. prot. Theol.,' 1875–6) has renewed the attack; to whom P. W. Schmidt has recently replied in his 'Neutest. Hyperkritik.'

[4] Of it, and 1 and 2 Thess., he writes, "Ces trois épîtres ont un caractère d'authenticité qui l'emporte sur toute autre considération." ('St. Paul,' Introd., p. vi.)

[5] He represents iii. 2–21 as a mere *cento* of

Digitized by Google

they are set down as marks of an alien hand.[1] He finds a trace of post-Pauline times in its opening salutation to the hierarchy (i. 1). By arbitrarily identifying St. Clement of Rome, whom (no doubt rightly) he holds to be the Clement mentioned in it (iv. 3),[2] with a later Clement, the Flavius Clemens who was, a generation later, the kinsman and the victim of Domitian,[3] he strives to force a definite anachronism on the writer. And in its chief doctrinal passage (ii. 6–11), he bewilders himself in the vain attempt to dissolve that clear and definite presentation of the Person and Work of the God-Man, into the cloudy phantasms of Gnosticism,—the *Sophia* of Valentinus, Marcion's doctrine of the Descent into Hades, and the Docetism of the same school;—all of them indications, to his perverted eye, of the thoughts of the Second Century!

A criticism so fantastic is perhaps rather to be regarded as a display of misdirected ingenuity than a serious attack. The notoriety of its author has, however, drawn forth more than one thorough refutation.[4]

ii. The *external* testimonies to our Epistle are ample. Its language meets us repeatedly in the pages of the earliest Christian literature, — of Clement of Rome, of Ignatius, of the Epistle to Diognetus, and of Polycarp.[5] The last-named, in his Epistle to the Philippians, reminds them that their Church was the honoured recipient of an Epistle from St. Paul.[1] But the first distinct citation of it appears to be in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, written A.D. 177, and preserved for us by Eusebius.[2] Within the same century it is quoted expressly, and as St. Paul's, by Irenæus and by Clement of Alexandria; also by Tertullian, from whom we farther learn[3] that it was among the ten Epistles acknowledged as St. Paul's by the heresiarch Marcion (140). It also appears in the Muratorian Canon, and all the other early Canons,—as well as in all the Versions,—of the New Testament.

B. Its *Integrity* has been questioned by a few critics,[4] who have mistaken the digression of the Third Chapter for an interpolated portion of another Epistle by the same hand. But a careful examination shews that chapter to be in close and strong (though not conspicuous) connection with the two preceding. Many of their topics recur in it; some of them—such as the Christian's *gain*, the Christian *race*,—in a developed form. The thoughts, the very words, of the great dogmatic passage of the Second chapter, reappear in a new aspect in the closing verses of the Third. Those verses, again, are linked with the beginning of the Fourth, by its opening "Therefore."[5]—Thus the Epistle is one,—not indeed in the unity of an artificial structure, but rather that of an organic and living growth. The threads,—frequently of suggestion rather than of

phrases from 1 and 2 Cor.; iii. 2–6, especially, as an echo of 2 Cor. xi. 18–22; iv. 10–15, as a mistake founded on 2 Cor. xi. 8, 9.

[1] *E.g.*, the expressions ἁρπαγμός, κύνες, κατατομή, δικαιοσύνη ἐν νόμῳ, σύζυγος (ii. 6; iii. 2; *ib.* 6; iv. 3).

[2] Baur misconstrues this passage to mean that Clement was at *Rome*, not at Philippi.

[3] Sueton., 'Domitian.,' 15.

[4] Wiesinger as above; Lünemann, 'Pauli ad Philipp. Ep.'; Brückner, 'Ep. ad Philipp. Paulo auct. vind.'; also Neander, 'Planting and Tr.,' II., p. 148 n. (Ryland's Transl.). For other authorities on the same side, see Hilgenfeld, 'Einleit.,' pp. 333, 334.

[5] See the passages collected by Bp. Lightfoot, Introd. ('The Genuineness'), pp. 74, 75. To those from 1 Clem. R. add;—ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν. . . . σκοπόν, XIX.;—ἐπὶ τὸν. . . . σκοπὸν. . . . καταντήσωμεν, LXIII.;—cp. Philipp. iii. 11, 14 (σκοπός occurring nowhere else in N. T.; nor, in this sense of "*goal*," anywhere in LXX, or in profane writers). Also, in a passage strongly recalling the tone of our Epistle, LXV. [LIX.], we have the ἐπιπόθητος of iv. 1 (a very rare word, nowhere else in N. T., nor in LXX). In view of these parallels, it can scarcely be doubted that St. Clement R. had read the Epistle to the Philippians, and drew from it these peculiar expressions.

The passage in Polyc., 'Ad Philipp.', XII., apparently uses the language of i. 11, and iii. 15, as well as of iii. 18.

[1] Polyc., 'Ad Philipp.,' III., XI.

[2] 'Hist. Eccl.', V. 2.

[3] 'Adv. Marcion.', V. 20.—See also Epiphan., 'Hæres.', XLII., 11, 12.

[4] Heinrichs, Paulus, &c. (*ap.* Olshausen and Wiesinger, Introd., § 4, 2.)

[5] Cp. iii. 3 with i. 26; 8–11 with i. 21; 11–14 with ii. 16; 19 with i. 28; 20 with i. 27; 21 with ii. 6–11: again, 20 with iv. 5.

Digitized by Google

logical sequence,—that bind together its several members, will be found traced out in the following Notes.

§ VI. ANALYSIS.

The following Analysis of the Epistle will serve to shew the order and inner connection of its parts.

I., Ch. i. 1–11. Introductory :—Greeting ;—The Apostle's thankful joy, affection, and prayers, for the Philippians.

II., i. 12–26. Account of the progress of the Gospel in Rome ;—of his position, feelings, and anticipations.

III., Exhortation :—
- (*a*) i. 27—ii. 4,—To stedfastness, and to unity and the virtues tending thereto ;
- (*b*) ii. 5–11,—Christ the Exemplar of such virtues ;
- (*c*) ii. 12–16,—To the further following out of the Christian life ;
- (*d*) ii. 17, 18,—To joyful looking for its end.

IV., ii. 19–30. Personal matters :—His purpose of sending Timothy to them ; his hope of revisiting them ; the return to them of Epaphroditus.

V., iii. 1. Final injunctions begun, [(but broken off by)

Digression into warning :—against
- (*a*) iii. 2–16,—*Judaic* error (enforced by the facts of his own past, and example of his present) ;
- (*b*) iii. 17–21,—*Antinomian* error (enforced by same example, and by the hope of the heavenly future).]

VI., Resumption of final injunctions :—
- (*a*) iv. 1. Stedfastness ;
- (*b*) iv. 2, 3. Mediation in a case of discord ;
- (*c*) iv. 4–9. Parting exhortations summed up.

VII., iv. 10–19. Acknowledgment of their bounty, past and present.

VIII., iv. 20–23. Conclusion :—Salutations and Benediction.

---

## SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE : On the Pauline Diction of this Epistle.

The following Lists exhibit the evidence furnished by the language of the Epistle, on its authorship, and relations with the other Pauline documents.

**List I.—Words and expressions in Philippians which are, in N. T., exclusively Pauline.**

(1) *General List.*—The following occur in the Pauline documents more or less generally :

**Philipp. i. 1,** *ἐπίσκοπος* [official].—**ib.,** *διάκονος* [official].—**i. 3,** *μνεία.*—**i. 8,** *μάρτυς Θεός.*—**i. 10,** *ἀπρόσκοπος.*—**i. 15,** *ἔρις.*—**i. 16, 18,** *καταγγέλλειν* [with a *person* as object].—**i. 24, ii. 25,** *ἀναγκαῖος* [= *necessary*].—**i. 26, ii. 16,** *καύχημα.*—**i. 30,** *ἀγών.*—**ii. 1,** *οἰκτιρμός.*—**ii. 10,** *κάμπτειν.*—**ii. 12,** *φόβος καὶ τρόμος.*—**ii. 16** (*bis*), *εἰς κενόν.*—**ii. 25,** *λειτουργός.*—**ii. 30,** *ἀναπληροῦν* [= *to fill up*].—**iii. 4,** *πεποίθησις.*—**iii. 20,** *ἀπεκδέχεσθαι* [? 1 Pet. iii. 20].—**iii. 21,** *ἐνέργεια.*—**iv. 3,** *γνήσιος.*—**iv. 9,** *ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης.*—**iv. 18,** *ὀσμή* [*metaph.*].—**ib.,** *εὐωδία.*—**ib.** *εὐάρεστος.*—(To these add) **iv. 11,** *αὐτάρκης* (*cp. αὐτάρκεια,* 2 Cor. ix. 8 ; 1 Tim. vi. 6).

(2) *Particular Lists.*—The following occur else only in some one group of them ; viz.,

In (*a*) Rom., 1 and 2 Corinth., Galat. :

**Philipp. i. 6,** *ἐνάρχεσθαι.*—**ib.,** *ἐπιτελεῖν* [opp. to *ἐνάρχ.*].—**i. 7,** *συγκοινωνός* [with *gen.* of thing].—**i. 10,** *τὰ διαφέροντα.*—**i. 15,** *εὐδοκία* [*human*].—**i. 20,** *ἀποκαραδοκία.*—**i. 22,** *ζῆν ἐν σαρκί.*—**i. 28,** *ἔνδειξις.*—**ii. 2, iv. 2,** *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν.*—**ii. 4, iii. 17,** *σκοπεῖν* [*transit.*].—**ii. 7,** *κενοῦν.*—**ii. 8,** *σχῆμα.*—**ii. 21,** *τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ζητεῖν.*—**ii. 22,** *δοκιμή.*—**ii. 25,** *ἀπόστολος* [= *messenger*].—**ii. 30,** *λειτουργία* [of service *to man*].—**iii. 9,** *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου.*—**ib.,** *δ. διὰ πίστεως.*—**iii. 14,** *βραβεῖον.*—**iii. 16,** *φθάνειν εἰς.*—**iii. 19,** *κοιλία* [= *greed.*].—**iii. 21,** *μετασχηματίζειν.*—**ib.,** *σύμμορφος.*—**iv. 7,** *νόημα.*—**iv. 15,** *κοινωνεῖν* [of *giving*].—(Add) **ii. 1,** *παραμύθιον* (*παραμυθία,* 1 Cor. xiv. 3).—**ii. 3,** *κενοδοξία* (*κενόδοξος,* Gal. v. 26).—**iii. 6,** *δικαιοσύνη ἐν νόμῳ* (*ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθαι,* Gal. iii. 11 ; v. 4).—**iv. 8,** *εὔφημος* (*εὐφημία,* 2 Cor. vi. 8).

In (*b*) Ephes., Coloss., Philem.

**Philipp. i. 11,** *πληροῦσθαι* [with *acc.*]—**i. 12,** *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ.*—**i. 19,** *ἐπιχορηγία.*—**ii. 25,** *συστρατιώτης.*—**iv. 18,** *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας.*—(Add) **iv. 7,** *εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ* (*εἰρ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ,* Col. iii. 15).

In (*c*). 1 and 2 Timoth., Titus :

**Philipp. i. 12, 25,** *προκοπή.*—**i. 21, iii. 7,** *κέρδος.*—**ii. 17,** *σπένδεσθαι.*—**iv. 8,** *σεμνός.*—(Add) **i. 23,** *ἀναλύειν* [= to *depart* ;—else only Luc. xii. 36, = to *return*], (*ἀνάλυσις,* 2 Tim. iv. 6).

In (*d*) Hebrews :

**Philipp. i. 7,** *βεβαίωσις.*—(Add) **i. 9,** *αἴσθησις,* (*αἰσθητήρια,* Hebr. v. 14).—**ii. 27,** *παραπλήσιον* (*παραπλησίως,* Hebr. ii. 14).

Digitized by Google

In (*e*) Pauline Speeches in Acts:

**Philipp. i. 10**, ἀπρόσκοπος [*passive*].—**i. 25**, οἶδα [of strong *belief*].—**i. 27**, πολιτεύεσθαι.—**ii. 29**, ἔχειν [= *to esteem*].—**iii. 7, 8**, ζημία.—(Add) **ii. 30**, τὸ ἔργον [of *the Gospel*;—see Bp. Lightfoot in *loc.*, and Acts xv. 38].

**List II.—Specially,** though **not exclusively, Pauline.**

(1) *General List:*

**Philipp. i. 7, 17**, ἀπολογία.—**i. 8, ii. 26**, ἐπιποθεῖν.—**i. 8, ii. 1**, σπλάγχνα.—**i. 9**, ἐπίγνωσις (2 Pet., *quater*).—**i. 14**, περισσοτέρως (? Mark xv. 14).—**i. 27**, ἀξίως (3 John 6).—**i. 27, iv. 1**, στήκειν (Mark xi. 25).—**i. 28**, ἀντικείμενος (Luc., *bis*).—**ii. 1**, παράκλησις.—**ii. 3**, ταπεινοφροσύνη (1 Pet. v. 5).—**ii. 12**, κατεργάζεσθαι.—**ii. 13**, ἐνεργεῖν.—**ii. 15, iii. 6**, ἄμεμπτος (Luc. i. 6).—**ii. 25, iv. 3**, συνεργός (3 John 8).—**ii. 28**, σπουδαίως [?] (Luc. vii. 4).—**ii. 30**, ὑστέρημα (Luc. xxi. 4).—**iii. 3**, λατρεύειν [absolutely] (Luc. ii. 37).—**ib.**, καυχᾶσθαι (James, *bis*).—**iii. 5**, φυλὴ Βενιαμίν (Rev. vii. 8).—**iii. 10**, πάθημα (1 Pet., *quater*).—**iii. 14**, κλῆσις (2 Pet. i. 10).—**iii. 17**, τύπος [of a *person*] (1 Pet. v. 3).—**iv. 9**, παραλαμβάνειν [= *traditum accipere*] (Mark vii. 4).—**iv. 13**, ἐνδυναμοῦν (Acts ix. 22).—**iv. 17**, πλεονάζειν (2 Pet. i. 8).

(2) *Particular List.*

(In (*a*) Rom., 1 & 2 Cor., Gal.):—

**Philipp. i. 16, ii. 3**, ἐριθεία (James, *bis*).—**ii. 7**, ὁμοίωμα (Rev. ix. 7).—**iii. 16**, στοιχεῖν (Acts xxi. 24).—**iv. 7**, φρουρεῖν (1 Pet. i. 5).—(Add) **i. 10**, εἰλικρινής (2 Pet. iii. 1;—εἰλικρινεία, 1 & 2 Cor., *ter*).

**List III.—Peculiar to this Epistle.**

(1) Not elsewhere in N. T.:

**Philipp. i. 9**, αἴσθησις (but see I. (2), *d*).—**i. 16**, ἁγνῶς (ἁγνὸς is Pauline, but not exclusively).—**i. 23**, ἀναλύειν (see I. (2), *c*).—**i. 27, iv. 3**, συναθλεῖν.—**i. 28**, πτύρεσθαι.—**ii. 1**, παραμύθιον (see I. (2), *a*).—**ii. 2**, σύμψυχος.—**ib.**, τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν.—**ii. 3**, κενοδοξία (see I. (2), *a*).—**ii. 6**, μορφὴ [in philosophic sense,—cp. Mark xvi. 12].—**ib.**, ἁρπαγμός.—**ib.**, ἴσα [*adverb*:—ἴσος elsewhere in N. T., but not in Paul].—**ii. 9**, ὑπερυψοῦν.—**ii. 10**, καταχθόνιος.—**ii. 12**, ἀπουσία.—**ii. 16**, λόγος ζωῆς [= *Gospel*].—**ib.**, ἐπέχειν [*transit.*].—**ii. 20**, ἰσόψυχος.—**ib.**, γνησίως (see I. (1), γνήσιος).—**ii. 27**, παραπλήσιον (see I. (2), *d*).—**ii. 28**, ἄλυπος.—**ii. 30**, παραβολεύεσθαι.—**iii. 1**, ὀκνηρός [of a *thing*].—**iii. 2**, κατατομή.—**iii. 5**, ὀκταήμερος.—**iii. 6**, δικαιοσύνη ἐν νόμῳ (see I. (2), *a*).—**iii. 8**, ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν [?].—**ib.**, σκύβαλον.—**iii. 9**, δικ. ἐκ Θεοῦ.—**ib.**, δ. ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει.—**iii. 10**, συμμορφίζεσθαι (but σύμμορφος, I. (2), *a*).—**iii. 11**, ἐξανάστασις.—**iii. 13**, ἐπεκτείνεσθαι.—**iii. 14**, σκοπός. (see § V., A, ii., n. 5).—**iii. 15**, ἑτέρως.—**iii. 17**, συμμιμητής.—**iii. 20**, πολίτευμα (πολιτεία, Eph. ii. 12).—**iv. 1**, ἐπιπόθητος (but ἐπιποθεῖν, II., (1)).—**iv. 3**, σύζυγος.—**iv. 7**, εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ (see I. (2), *b*).—**iv. 8**, προσφιλής.—**ib.**, εὔφημος (see I. (2), *a*).—**iv. 10**, μεγάλως.—**ib.**, ἀναθάλλειν.—**ib.**, ἀκαιρεῖν.—**iv. 11**, αὐτάρκης (see I. (1)).—**iv. 12**, μυεῖσθαι.—**iv. 15**, λῆψις.

(2) Elsewhere in N. T., but not Pauline:

**Philipp. i. 10**, εἰλικρινής (see II. (2)).—**i. 13**, πραιτώριον.—**ii. 14**, γογγυσμός.—**ii. 15**, ἀμώμητος (2 Pet. iii. 14 [?]).—**ib.** μέσον [*advb.*] (Matt. xiv. 24).—**ib.**, σκολιός.—**ib.**, φωστήρ (Rev. xxi. 11).—**ii. 23**, ἐξαυτῆς.—**ii. 26**, ἀδημονεῖν (Matt. xxvi. 37; ‖ Mark).—**ii. 29**, ἔντιμος.—**iii. 2**, κύων.—**iv. 3**, συλλαμβάνεσθαι [= to *help*] (Luc. v. 7).—**ib.**, βίβλος ζωῆς (Rev., *passim*; β. nowhere else in Paul).—**iv. 6**, αἴτημα.—**iv. 8**, ἀρέτη [*human*] (2 Pet. i. 5, *bis*:—cp. 1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3 [*divine*]).—**iv. 11**, ὑστέρησις (Mark xii. 44).—**iv. 15**, δόσις (James i. 17).

Most of the coincidences shewn in Lists I. and II. relate to group *a*. Of these, the greater part are yielded by Romans.

No fewer than thirteen expressions, gathered out of so short an Epistle, serve to connect it with St. Paul's speeches in Acts;—viz.,

ἀναγκαῖος [= *necessary*] (Acts xiii. 46).—ἀπολογία (xxii. 1).—ἀπρόσκοπος (xxiv. 16).—ἐπίσκοπος [official], (xx. 28).—ἔργον, τό [of the *Gospel*], xv. 38).—ἔχειν [= *to esteem*], (xx. 24). ζημία (xxvii. 10; 21).—καταγγέλλειν [with *person* as obj.], (xvii. 3; 23).—λατρεύειν [absol.], (xxvi. 7).—οἶδα [of strong *belief*], (xx. 25).—πολιτεύεσθαι (xxiii. 1).—ταπεινοφροσύνη (xx. 19)—φυλὴ Βενιαμίν (xiii. 21).

(See Introd. to Acts, § 8, p. 342, note 2.)

---

The references made, in this Introduction and in the following Notes, to St. Clement of Rome, are to the excellent edition published at Constantinople, 1875, by Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Serræ; in which are printed for the first time, from a MS. discovered by him, the conclusion of chapter lvi. of the First Epistle, and six following chapters, supplying the *lacuna* in Codex A.

Those to Theodore of Mopsuestia, are to the Latin Version of the Commentaries on St. Paul, lately identified as his by Professors Jacobi and Hort;—admirably edited (with the Greek fragments) by the Rev. H. B. Swete (Cambridge, 1880).

---

The late Dean Jeremie, who had undertaken the Commentary on this Epistle, left in MS. at his death a large body of notes on it, the fruit of his varied research and mature learning. From these valuable but incomplete materials, such portions as seem suitable for the purposes of this Commentary have been selected and placed among the following Notes,—distinguished by the subscribed initial J.—The rest of the Notes (without subscription), and the general arrangement of this part of the Commentary as a whole, are the work of Dean Gwynn.

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# PHILIPPIANS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

3 *He testifieth his thankfulness to God, and his love toward them, for the fruits of their faith, and fellowship in his sufferings,* 9 *daily praying to him for their increase in grace:* 12 *he sheweth what good the faith of Christ had received by his troubles at Rome,* 21 *and how ready he is to glorify Christ either by his life or death,* 27 *exhorting them to unity,* 28 *and to fortitude in persecution.*

PAUL and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at

---

CHAP. I. 1, 2. OPENING SALUTATION.

1. *Paul*] Here, as in writing to the Thessalonians and to Philemon, St. Paul omits the designation of himself as "*an Apostle*," elsewhere in his Epistles uniformly subjoined to his name in the opening. This style is in keeping with the character of the Epp. to which it belongs; unofficial, informal,—addressed, one to a personal friend, the others to Churches with which his relations were more than ordinarily familiar and affectionate, where there was no need that he should assert himself to overbear opposition, or to affirm doctrine or discipline with an Apostle's authority. The omission cannot be explained (as some suggest) by the fact that the name of Timothy, who was not an Apostle, is here joined with his; for elsewhere (2 Cor. i. 1, and Col. i. 1) we read, "Paul *an Apostle* . . . . and *Timothy*."

*and Timotheus*] Timothy was with him when he wrote—was about to be sent shortly by him to the Philippians (below, ii. 19)—had previously been well known to them as being one of his company when he first visited their city (Acts xvi. 1–12 sqq.; see below, ii. 22), and apparently in two subsequent visits (Acts xix. 22 and xx. 1; *ib.* 3–6). Thus he is naturally joined in this salutation to them. But it is not to be hence inferred that he was *joint author* of the Ep., which is written (*v.* 3, and sqq.) in the first person singular, and speaks of Timothy (ii. 19–23) in the third person: nor even that he was the *scribe* (see note on 2 Cor. i. 1). The name of Timothy appears in like manner at the head of two other Epp. written about the same time as this, those to the Colossians and Philemon; also of three earlier Epp., 2 Cor., and (with "Silvanus" preceding it) 1 and 2 Thess.—Cp. also 1 Cor. i. 1; Gal. i. 2. In 2 Cor., Coloss., and 1 and 2 Thess., he proceeds in the plural number; in 1 Cor., Gal., and Philem., as here, in the singular.

*the servants of Jesus Christ*] Better, "**slaves of Christ Jesus**" (see Rom. i. 1, and note; and omit "*the*"). He is their "Lord." They are His property (1 Cor. vii. 22, 23). But such servitude is true freedom (Rom. vi. 18–22; 2 Cor. iii. 17).—J.

*to all the saints*] It seems that no special emphasis here rests on "*all*" (cp. Rom. i. 7; 2 Cor. i. 1): but see note on *v.* 4.

The term "saints" (ἅγιοι), used as here absolutely, as a common designation of all Christians, appears in the opening salutations of all St. Paul's Epp. to Churches, except those to the Thessalonians (the earliest written), and to the Galatians (the most severe in tone of them all). In most of his Epp. it is frequent in this sense. In Hebr. it is so used twice (vi. 10; xiii. 24); in Jude once (3); frequently in Revelation; in Acts rarely (only in ix. 13, 32, 41,—and in xxvi. 10, where St. Paul is the speaker); in the Gospels nowhere (as applied to followers of Christ); nor in the Epp. of St. James, St. Peter, or St. John. It was drawn from the language of the O. T., the corresponding term (קדשים, ἅγιοι, LXX.) being used of the people of Israel (*e.g.*, Ps. xxxiii. [xxxiv.] 9). In the N. T. it denotes not so much *internal holiness* (though that is the direct effect of Christianity) as the *new relation* in which Christians stand to God through Christ. So, 1 Cor. vii. 14, the "children" of Christians are said to be "*holy*."—J.

The connection of "in Christ Jesus" is as in A. V., with "saints." They are "saints"



Digitized by Google

Philippi, with the bishops and deacons:

2 Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.

3 I thank my God upon every [1]remembrance of you,

4 Always in every prayer of mine for you all making request with joy,

[1] Or, *mention*.

---

in so far as they are "in Christ." Their outward union with Him is their claim to the title; so far as that union is inwardly realized, the title indicates a corresponding inward reality of holiness.

*Philippi*] See above, Introd., § II.

*bishops and deacons*] From Chrysostom (whom see *in loc.*) downwards, it has been generally admitted by writers of diverse views on Church government that the office of the "*bishops*" here addressed is the same as that of the "*elders*" elsewhere spoken of (Acts xi. 30, and *passim*). So St. Paul calls the *elders* of Ephesus *bishops* (πρεσβυτέρους, Acts xx. 17; ἐπισκόπους, *ib.* 28—A.V., "overseers"). And so, after speaking (Tit. i. 5) of the ordination of *elders*, he proceeds, "For a *bishop* must be blameless" (*ib.* 7). And such is apparently the meaning of "*bishop*" in 1 Tim. iii. 2 sqq. (followed by "*deacons*," *ib.* 8, as here).—*Elder* marks the dignity, *overseer* the duty, of the office. The former title is of Jewish, the latter of Gentile, origin. See Notes on "*bishops* . . ." at end of chapter.

But this indiscriminate use of the *titles* is far from justifying the inference that there was no distinction of *order* and office in the Ministry of the Apostolic age. The facts of the case seem to be, that the authority to rule and to ordain, originally vested in the Apostles as the First Order, was imparted by them to those whom, like Timothy and Titus, they admitted, though without giving them any distinctive title, to that Order as their successors in governing the Churches and propagating the ministry; and that, as the original Apostolic body passed away and with it the title of Apostle, the term *Bishop* became appropriated to the First Order, ceasing to be synonymous with *Presbyter* (or *Elder*), which remained as the designation of the Second Order. (See Theodoret *in loc.*, and on 1 Tim. iii. 1: Hooker, 'E. P.,' VII. ii. 2; xi. 3, 4: Bentley, as cited above on Acts xx. 28.)

Here, then, we have a salutation to the Second and Third Orders of the Ministry only. This may be either (1) because St. Paul regards himself as Bishop of the Philippians, as is confirmed by the fact of his taking maintenance of them (Potter, 'Church Government,' III.); or (2) because Epaphroditus, who was with him when he wrote, was their Bishop; which seems highly probable (see iv. 3, and note).

But perhaps we are to regard the term "*bishops*" here as including the *Chief* Pastor of Philippi with the rest,—the First Order with the Second.

It is observable that they are saluted *after* the "saints." "The mention of them is *separate*, because the shepherds are distinct from the flock; it is *secondary*, because they exist for the flock." (Rilliet *in loc.*—J.)

2. *Grace . . . . and peace*] See note on Rom. i. 7.

*from God our Father and* from *the Lord Jesus Christ*] The Socinian rendering, "God the Father of us and of the Lord Jesus Christ," is untenable, in view of Titus i. 4, where we have "from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," without "of us."

3–8. His Prayerful Thankfulness, Confidence, and Affection.

3. *I thank my God*] Nearly all St. Paul's Epp. (with a few exceptions readily accounted for) open with words of thanksgiving;—hardly anywhere, except perhaps in 1 and 2 Thess., so full and fervent as these. They overflow with personal feeling towards his friends, and yet more towards Him Whom he claims as "*my* God" (as iv. 19, where see note;—so Rom. i. 8, and elsewhere in his Epp.: also in O. T., compare, among others, the thanksgiving passages, Ps. civ. 33; cxviii. 28).—"For you, for your faith, for your lovingkindness, I thank Him, for He is *my* God, to whom I owe all."

*upon every remembrance of you*] Rather, "**on all** (*i. e.*, **the whole of**) **my remembrance of you**." Everything he could call to mind concerning them was to him matter of thankfulness.—J.

4. *Always in every prayer of mine for you all*] It is best to treat all these words as dependent on "I thank," placing commas after "mine" and "all."—"I *thank* God for you all" (Rom. i. 8; 1 Thess. i. 2), suits the context better than to connect "*prayer* for you all," or "making *request* for you all." Thus is brought out the characteristic iteration, so expressive of earnestness, "on *all* my remembrance,—at *all* times,—in *all* my prayer,—for you *all*" (πάσῃ, πάντοτε, πάσῃ, πάντων). Thus also is best shewn

5 For your fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now;

6 Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you [1]will perform *it* until the day of Jesus Christ:

[1] Or, *will finish it.*

7 Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because [1]I have you in my heart; inasmuch as both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are [1]partakers of my grace.

[1] Or, *you have me in your heart.*

[1] Or, *partakers with me of grace*

---

(in connection with the principal verb rather than with the subordinate nouns) the delicate tact with which, by including "*all*" in his thanksgiving, he prepares the way for the ensuing exhortations to unity (*v.* 27; ii. 2–4).

*making request with joy*] Lit., "making the prayer." The words are parenthetical, describing the nature of the "prayer" just spoken of. "**In every prayer of mine (and with joy I make such prayer).**" Thus the force of the article is brought out; and the awkward and unlikely construction is avoided, "in every *prayer* of mine making *the prayer*" (δεήσει . . . . τὴν δέησιν), which A. V. disguises by substituting "request" for the second "*prayer*."

*with joy*] The opening expression of *thanksgiving* combined with *prayer* is common to this Ep. with others (Rom., 1 Thess., &c.); but the "*joy*" is peculiar to this. Here the Apostle first strikes the "keynote" (as it has been said) of rejoicing that distinguishes this from the rest. "Summa epistolæ; *gaudeo, gaudete.*" (Bengel, *in loc.*) Cp. i. 18, 25; ii. 2, 17, 18, 28; iii. 1; iv. 1, 4, 10.

5. *For your fellowship* . . . .] These words state the *object* of his thanksgiving, as the words "on all my remembrance" assign its *occasion*. Both shades of meaning are given by the same Greek preposition (ἐπί).

*fellowship in the gospel from the first day*] Rather, "**fellowship towards** (εἰς) . . . ." He thanks God that, "from the first day" of their conversion to the Faith, they have been moved to *sympathetic co-operation towards its furtherance*. The Philippians attached themselves to St. Paul and his doctrine from the very earliest days of his work among them (cp. iv. 15; Acts xvi. 14–40). The noun (κοινωνία) is not to be restricted here to the meaning "*liberality*" (as Rom. xv. 26), though that is included. Nor does it mean "co-operation with *one another*," but with *him and his mission* (cp. *v.* 7, and note on "partakers").

*until now*] They have proved their "fellowship" by their recent bounty (ii. 25; iv. 10–18), and are proving it in their present demeanour under trials (*vv.* 7, 29, 30).

6. *Being confident* . . . .] His thankfulness is accompanied by a confidence for their future, grounded on his knowledge of what God has done for and in them in the past. This is no supposed assurance resting on an assumed insight into God's eternal decrees. It is "a hope built on the faithfulness of God, Who will carry out what He has begun. It is not His way to do things by halves" (Neander, *in loc.*). Cp. Ps. cxxxviii. 8.

*he which hath begun a good work* . . . . *will perform*] Translate, "**He Which began** (aor.) . . . **will finish**" (as marg.) or "**complete**";—scil., by their salvation. The verbs (ἐναρξάμενος, and ἐπιτελέσει) being both sacrificial (Bp. Lightfoot, *in loc.*), suggest the metaphor which appears distinctly below ii. 17. The "good work" is *God's* work of making them "saints" (*v.* 1)—consecrating them to His service. Yet is it, in its progress, *their* work also (cp. ii. 12, 13); the service of "fellowship" in doing and suffering (next *v.*). But its first and last are His alone Who is the Beginning and the End.

*until the day of Jesus Christ*] As he looked back *thankfully* to the "first day" (*v.* 5) of the origin of their faith, so does he look forward *confidently* to "the day" of its consummation—the Last Day. On his expectation of the Second Coming, see Introd. to 1 Thess., II. B, 2. Cp. iii. 21; iv. 5, below.

7. *as it is meet*] Lit., "**right.**" This confidence is accorded as their *just* due; not in mere general charity, but in the love that springs from his experience of them.

*because I have you in my heart*] "The depth of his love warrants the fulness of his confidence." (Bp. Ellicott, *in loc.*) The other rendering "because *you* have *me* in *your* heart," agrees ill with the position of the pronouns in the Greek, and obscures the course of thought, indicated above. The following *v.* ("*For* . . . . I long after you all") is conclusive on this point.

*both in my bonds, and in the defence* . . . .] These words are rightly connected in A. V. with the following, "are partakers;" not, as by some, with the preceding "I have you in my heart." They describe the extent and nature of the "fellowship" of *v.* 5; as being one not of feeling merely, but actually realized by them: *actively*, by promoting the Gospel and aiding its promoters,—and *passively*, in suffering, as he does, for Christ (*vv.* 29, 30).



Digitized by Google

8 For God is my record, how greatly I long after you all in the bowels of Jesus Christ.

9 And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and *in* all [1]judgment;

[1] Or, *sense*.

---

*the defence and confirmation of* . . .] So A. V., rightly. Though a prisoner, he can both *defend* the Gospel (cp. *v.* 17, which fixes the meaning of this) against gainsayers; and *confirm* it (see *v.* 14) by strengthening the faith and zeal of believers. He cannot mean (as some explain) his "*defence*" before "Cæsar's judgment seat" (even supposing it to have taken place before he wrote this). For the article, prefixed to the former only of these two nouns, joins it with the latter, "*confirmation*," so as to make both relate to the following genitive, "of the Gospel." See Winer, 'Grammar,' Pt. III. § 19, 4 (*b*).

*ye all are*] The pronoun (ὑμᾶς="you," "ye") is repeated, in order again to bring in the "all." Thus in this and next *v.* we find "you *all*" three times over. As in his thanksgiving (*v.* 4, where see note), so here in his reliance on their practical sympathy, his confidence for their future, his longing affection, they *all* alike are included.

*partakers of my grace*] Translate, "**partakers with me of the grace**" (τῆς χάριτος—scil., the grace given to me). It gives him opportunity and strength to bear imprisonment, and even in his bonds to further the Gospel; and it has given them like privilege and fortitude (cp. *v* 29, "*it was given* . . . to suffer," ἐχαρίσθη). Hence a sympathetic bond between him and them; hence his love for them and his assurance concerning them.

Peirce's interpretation (*in loc.*), adopted by Paley (' Horæ Paul.,' VII., i.),—"joint contributors to the gift which I have received"—is to be rejected as narrowing and lowering the scope of the passage.

**8.** Above (*v.* 7) he has declared the feelings of "his heart." Now, with an expression of startling force, fitly introduced by the solemn attestation, "God is my record," he rises from the range of human feeling into the Divine, and identifies his longing affection for them with the yearning that is "in the *bowels of Jesus Christ.*"

*God is my record*] "**My witness.**" "Not as though they distrusted him does he call God to witness; but because he lacks words to express his earnest disposition towards them, he leaves this to God" (Theophylact, *in loc.*). Cp. Rom. i. 9.

*bowels of Jesus Christ*] Not merely love *like Christ's*: or "love such as my fatherly relation to you in Christ engenders" (Chrys.); but rather (as Bengel says, "Paulus non in Pauli sed Jesu Christi movetur visceribus"), the feelings and emotions of the Human Nature of the Lord Himself (see Note at end of ch.), the love with which He loves His brethren, appropriated as his own by the Apostle, in intense realization of that incorporation with Him, which elsewhere he expresses in the words, "I live; yet not I, but *Christ liveth in me*" (Gal. ii. 20). Accordingly, this holy yearning is not merely (as ii. 24) for a meeting in the flesh, but for the final and inseparable reunion in Christ.

9–11. WHAT HE PRAYS FOR THEM.

**9.** *And this I pray, that* . . .] Hitherto (*vv.* 3–8) he has spoken of his *thanksgiving* on their behalf, its occasion, object, and grounds: here, with the copulat. "*and,*" he resumes the mention of *prayer* (from *v.* 4, above), and tells them *what* it is that he asks for them in the habitual intercession there implied. He has given thanks for their "fellowship:" he now prays that the "love" which inspires it may be (1) *increased*, (2) *regulated.* (For "*that,*" see Note at end of ch.)

It is in keeping with the tone of approval which marks this Ep., that, instead of chiding them for shortcomings, he thus tenderly reminds them to seek spiritual progress.

*your love may abound yet more and more*] Not merely their love *for him*, nor love for any limited object, but the spirit of Love in its widest Christian sense. Their "fellowship" (*v.* 5) implies that such "love" is in them: his prayer is, that they may have more of it. Chrys. (though unduly limiting the word to their personal love) says well on this, "The measure of love is, nowhere to stand still." Similarly Bengel, "*The fire that saith not, It is enough* [Prov. xxx. 16] is in the Apostle." Cp. Bacon's saying, "Sola charitas non admittit excessum" (' De Augm. Sc.,' VII. 3).

*in knowledge and* in *all judgment*] But *mere* increase of love will not do, for Love may mislead or mistake; it must be an increase within the sphere where Love's workings are ruled by "*full knowledge*" (ἐπιγνώσει), and "**every** [other form of] **perception**" (αἰσθήσει,—marg., "*sense*"). Such "knowledge" and "perception" belong to, and regulate, the instinct of Love.

The Christian acquires by grace a *spiritual* "sense," similar to the "*moral* sense" of ethical philosophy (Hutcheson), and, like it, so called as being analogous in its nature to *bodily* sense. Here "*sense* is the genus"

Digitized by Google

1 Or, try. 10 Or, differ.

10 That ye may [1]approve things that [1]are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ;

11 Being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.

12 But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things *which*

---

[spiritual perception in general], "*knowledge* is the species,—and the noblest, as sight among the bodily senses" (Bengel). See Note at end of ch.

**10.** *That ye may approve things that are excellent*] The verb means, (1) to test or prove (as marg., "try"), (2) to approve. Here it has the latter sense; as Rom. ii. 18, where see note. Their "knowledge" and "perception" are to be so directed as to "approve" what is truly "excellent" and worthy to be loved; and thus to guide their "love" aright. This coheres better with the preceding *v.* than the other rendering,—"distinguish things that differ": for ripeness of *knowledge* and subtlety of *perception* have their proper exercise less in recognizing the broad distinctions of good and evil, than in discriminating the finer shades of good and better;—so as to choose "non modo præ malis bona, sed in bonis optima" (Bengel).

*that ye may be* . . . ] This is usually understood to declare the *ultimate* purpose of the "knowledge and perception" prayed for, their *immediate* aim being declared in the words "that ye may approve." "God grant you such judgment that you may prefer the best; *to the end that* (ἵνα) ye may be pure," &c. But it seems better to regard this as a second and independent head of prayer, understanding "that," as in last *v.* (where see Add. Note), as merely introductory of the verb which expresses the object prayed for. Thus he prays (1) *that* (ἵνα) their *love* may be increased and ordered aright (*v.* 9), (2) *that* (ἵνα) their *life* may be blameless and fruitful (*vv.* 10, 11). (The intervening "*that*" of A.V., stands for εἰς with infinit., not for ἵνα with conj.)

*sincere*] "**Pure**" (εἰλικρινεῖς) as the corn purged by the *winnowing* fan (if we derive the word ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴλειν),—or as the gem proved by the *sunbeam* (if from εἵλη). Bp. Lightfoot however regards the word as originally a "strategical term," applied to the ordering of troops (from εἴλη or ἴλη, a squadron), "distinct," thence "unsullied."

*without offence*] That is, "**without stumbling**" (ἀπρόσκοποι). The word is capable of the transitive sense, "not *causing* any to stumble," as 1 Cor. x. 32. But the intransitive sense "not *caused* to stumble," "without falling," as Acts xxiv. 16 (spoken by St. Paul), agrees best with the context here, to which their conduct *to others* is not pertinent.

Cp. 1 Clem. R., XX., where the derived adverb is used. "The winds perform their courses *without hindrance*" (ἀπροσκόπως,—intrans.). (Beausobre, *in loc.*—J.) See also *ib.* LXI.

Thus his prayer is that they may be *pure* (inwardly); and *blameless* (outwardly).

*till the day*] Rather "**against the day.**" The prep. (εἰς) distinctly brings out the idea of *preparation for* the judgment, faintly above indicated by "*until*" (ἄχρις), of *v* 6.

**11.** *filled with the fruits of righteousness* . . . ] Not "*fruits*" but "**fruit**" (so all best MSS.). As of their "love" (*v.* 9), so here he assumes the existence of their "righteousness," and prays for its increase, in the shape of "fruit." Its origin is in the "good work begun in them" *by God* (*v.* 6). Its progress in fruitfulness is to be "**that which is through** *Jesus Christ.*" It works to an end transcending all, "unto the glory and praise *of God.*" Thus it is, in the fullest sense, from first to last and throughout, the "Righteousness *of God*" of the Ep. to the Romans (i. 17)—"begun, continued, and [to be] ended," in Him. And thus the doctrine of that Ep. touching the source and nature of righteousness, is here distinctly implied; its express statement following below (iii. 9).

*glory and praise of God*] "*Glory,*" in the shewing forth of God's work;—"*praise,*" in the ascription of that work to Him.

### 12–14. Reassuring Account of his Imprisonment and its Results.

**12.** *But I would* . . .] From his thankful and prayerful joy in them, he now passes, "*but*" (δέ) marking the transition, to the task of dispelling the sorrowful apprehensions which he has heard, or assumes, that they feel concerning him. He writes as one well assured of their care for his welfare.

*the things* which happened *unto me*] Lit., "**the things concerning me**" (τὰ κατ' ἐμέ). He will not call them his *sufferings*, or *dangers*, but uses this general phrase. It is found also Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7:—A.V., "my affairs," "my state."

*rather unto the furtherance*] That is, "so as to further *rather* [than, as might be feared, to hinder]." The advb. replies to their fears without directly mentioning them.

This "furtherance" is twofold: as follows:

Digitized by Google

*happened* unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel;

13 So that my bonds [1]in Christ are manifest in all [2]the palace, and [3]in all other *places*;

14 And many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear.

15 Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will:

16 The one preach Christ of con-

[1] Or, *for Christ.*
[2] Or, *Cæsar's court.*
[3] Or, *to all others.*

---

13. *First result* (introduced by "so that") *of his bonds*; the effect on the minds of those who came in contact with him, and through them on others.

*my bonds in Christ are manifest*] Rather, "**are become manifest [as being] in Christ**"; undergone in His cause, not for any misdeed. His discourses, and conduct, would leave on his guards and visitors the impression that his imprisonment was for no crime, but for his devotion to Christ (Cp. Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1; Col iv. 3; Philem. 1, 9).—J.

*in all the palace*] Lit., "**in the whole Prætorium**" (Πραιτωρίῳ). That is, "The cause of my bonds, and thereby the Name of Christ, have become known even in the Imperial Residence."—Of his visitors (Acts xxviii. 30), some would have acquaintances among the numerous members of the Emperor's Household, some might themselves belong to it. The Prætorian soldiers, likewise, who in turn "kept him" (*ib.* 16), would in regular course be ordered to the Palatium, there to guard the Emperor's person. Thus, carried by those who came into contact with him in his prison, his case and his message would be heard of in the "Palace." "Prætorium" accordingly is here rightly taken by A.V. as meaning *Palatium*,—following Chrys., &c., (τὰ βασίλεια), and supported by iv. 22, "Cæsar's household." The context excludes the marginal rendering, "Cæsar's *Court*" (*i.e., judgment hall*); for what he here tells of is not the result of any public hearing of his appeal, but an indirect effect of his bonds;—namely, that the Gospel has penetrated into the Imperial *Household*.

Most moderns, however, following Perizonius ('De Prætorio'), explain, "My imprisonment for Christ's sake has become known throughout the Imperial *Body-guard*." —Of these, some take the "Prætorium" to be (1) the great fortified *Camp* of the "Prætorian Cohorts," outside the walls (Tacit., 'Annal.,' IV. 2, where see Orelli's note). Others (2) the *Barrack* attached to the Palatium as quarters for the companies of the Guard actually on duty there. Others, (3) the "*Prætorian Cohorts*" themselves. (See Note at end of ch.)

*and in all other* places] More probably (as marg.) "**to all others**," or "**all the rest**"; not only to those about the Emperor (whether his *household* or his *body-guard*), but generally among the inhabitants of the city.

14. *Second result of his bonds*; brethren encouraged to preach boldly.

*many of the brethren in the Lord...*] Correctly, "**most of the brethren**," "the greater part,"—leaving room for the exceptions to be introduced in next *v.* The words "in the Lord," naturally though they attach themselves to "the brethren," are better joined with the following (see next note). There is no true parallel in N. T. for the expression "brethren *in the Lord*," which would in fact be tautological; "*the brethren*" (without "*in the Lord*") sufficiently denoting *Christians*.

*in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds*] Rather, "**having in the Lord confidence in my bonds**" (ἐν Κυρίῳ πεποιθότας). His imprisonment, borne as he bears it and used as he uses it, serves but to confirm their faith. Accordingly his "bonds" are to them the object of a confidence, not human, but resting "in the Lord,"—for these bonds are "in Christ" (last *v.*), Who is with His imprisoned Apostle. And it manifests itself in increasing courage "to speak the word." (Read, with best MSS., "**the word of God**.")—For the connection here preferred, cp. ii. 24, "I trust in the Lord" (πέποιθα ἐν Κ.).

15–18. SUCH RESULTS, HOWEVER ATTAINED, ARE TO HIM JOY.

15. *Some indeed preach....*] Yet not all who preach are actuated by such spirit. "**There are some who preach**" from inferior, nay, from evil motives; "**even because of** (διὰ with accus.) **envy and strife**." These of course are not included in the *faithful* preachers of last *v.*, but are the exceptions there tacitly pointed to.

Those who "are confident in his bonds" are now reintroduced as the "**some also**" who preach "**because of goodwill;**" the two classes being thus sharply contrasted. The conjn. (καὶ) in the former instance ("*even*"), belongs to "because of envy";—in the latter ("*also*"), to the second "some."

*good will*] That is, towards *the writer himself* (as the personal nature of the passage

Digitized by Google

tention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds:

17 But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel.

18 What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.

---

shews); not towards the *Gospel*, or the *salvation of men* (as some explain). The word is elsewhere mostly used of the *Divine* "good pleasure" (as ii. 13); but of *human* "good will," Rom. x. 1 (possibly also Luke ii. 14), which latter sense the context here requires.

**16, 17.** These verses must be transposed (the μὲν and δὲ changing places); the weight of authority being against the arrangement of A. V. (likewise of Rec.,— for convenience retained in the following notes);—which is evidently a correction, made to avoid the inversion (by *chiasmus*) of the order of the members of last *v.* ("some of envy . . . some of goodwill"). See Note at end of ch.

**16.** *preach*] The verb here used (καταγγέλλειν) differs from that in the preceding *v.* (κηρύσσειν), only as *to announce* (as a *messenger*) differs from *to proclaim* (as a *herald*). So Vulg. well renders there "*prædicant*," here "*annunciant*." Of the two verbs, *that* is used of all preachers, even the Lord Himself: *this* (peculiar to Acts and Pauline Epp.) only of those sent by Him.

*of contention*] Translate, "**of factiousness**" (ἐξ ἐριθείας), as Rom. ii. 8, where see note. The rendering of A.V. (Vulg., "*contentione*"), apparently suggested by a mistaken etymology (as if from ἔρις, *strife*), can only be retained as an imperfect approximation to the true meaning. Old Lat. gives "*dissensione*"; Tertullian better, "*æmulatione*" ('Adv. Marcion.,' V. 20).

We are not however to think of the Church in Rome as divided, in these early days, into organized *parties*. The evil here pointed at, is that of a spirit of personal enmity, shewing itself in *factious antagonism* to St. Paul's teaching and influence.

*not sincerely*] "**Not with pure motives**" (ἁγνῶς), but with a leaven of ill feeling.

*supposing*] "Imagining (but erroneously) that they can hurt me,"—opposed to "*knowing*" in *v.* 17.

*to add affliction*] Read "**to stir up**" (ἐγείρειν, "*suscitare*," Vulg., &c.), as the weight of authority requires.—(A. V. represents ἐπιφέρειν,—so Rec.) These persons, he says, preaching not for the Gospel's sake but in a spirit of envious opposition to him, endeavour to take advantage of his confinement in advancing their rival claims as teachers of the Gospel (see below on *v.* 18), and thus to make him feel his bonds more grievous in the sense of his forced inaction contrasted with their hostile activity.

The meaning cannot be (as many suppose) that they sought by their preaching to draw down the displeasure of the authorities on him as the leader of the sect, and thus increase the rigour of his imprisonment. This they could not do without danger, in the first instance, to themselves (Neander).

**17.** *of love, knowing that I am set . . . .*] As those, in their "factiousness" would embitter his bonds by their rival teaching; so these, in their "love" for him, seek by working for and with him to relieve the heaviness of his prison; because they honour his chains as the insignia of the champion "*set* for the defence of the Gospel." This is the true force of the verb;—the idea of *lying in suffering*, or *lying inactive*, attached to it by some, is alien from the spirit of the Ep. In 1 Thess. iii. 3 (not written in prison) it is similarly used ("we are *appointed*," A.V.).

**18.** The *motive* of their preaching is to give him pain: its *result* is overruled to the spread of the Gospel, and therefore he "rejoices."

*in pretence*] This word raises the questions: How can the Apostle "rejoice" in such men's preaching? What was their teaching, and who were they?

We are not told what their *doctrine* was; nor does St. Paul imply that it was erroneous: their *motives* only are censured. Had it been essentially unsound, we cannot suppose that he would have "rejoiced." Thus "the passage holds out no sanction for heretical preaching, as it is often made to do" (Blunt, 'On the Early Fathers,' p. 290).—J. (See Note at end of ch.)

That they were of the Judaizing faction, with its "other Gospel," seems hardly possible. His reprobation of such teachers is nowhere more energetically expressed than in this Ep.,—see iii. 2. It is not sufficient to explain (as some do) that *here* he rejoices because the Gospel facts are being proclaimed to heathens, while *there* he denounces those that would pervert Christians. For this *v.*, if taken as applying to Judaizers, is not merely inconsistent with that, but would utterly break the force of the latter as a warning to the Philippians.

We are to understand, accordingly, that he rejoices because (as Theodt. says), "even unwillingly the enemies of the truth work

Digitized by Google

19 For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ,

20 According to my earnest expectation and *my* hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but *that* with all boldness, as always, *so* now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether *it be* by life, or by death.

21 For to me to live *is* Christ, and to die *is* gain.

---

for the truth, teaching good things though not in a good spirit" (καλὰ μέν, οὐ καλῶς δέ). So Chrys., "They preached sound doctrine, but with corrupt aim and purpose."

The passage, understood as above, though it does not yield the lessons of indulgence towards error which some have forced from it, yet tends to charity; as teaching a hopeful trust in the vital power of the Gospel to prevail, even though its preachers be inspired by selfishness and jealousy.

*will rejoice*] Accurately, "**shall** rejoice;"—not with fitful effort, but with stedfast joy, as one assured of the final issue.

### 19, 20. Grounds of this Joy.

**19.** *For I know that this . . .*] The connection is mainly with "shall rejoice" (last *v.*). "In this" (scil., the fact that Christ is preached) "I rejoice *now;* nay more, in the same I anticipate further and continuing joy; for *this*" (same pronoun, in same sense as before),—"this spread of the Gospel will, I am well assured, issue for me in salvation." Neither "safety," nor "deliverance," nor any meaning short of this highest one, will suit what follows.

*this shall turn to my salvation*] Verbatim from Job xiii. 16 (LXX.).—J.

*through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit*] He takes for granted,—perhaps they have assured him of,—their prayers for him; and on these he humbly rests his hope of the grace to be bestowed (Chrys.). "The *prayer* goes up to heaven,—the *supply* comes down from heaven" (Bengel). In the sentence "by your prayer and the supply of the Spirit," the two nouns "are fitly connected by the same article (τῆς), for *the supply of the Spirit* is the answer to their *prayer*" (Bp. Lightfoot). See Winer, as above on *v.* 7. The words "*of the Spirit*" (genit. obj. not subj.) designate Him, not as *giving* the supply, but as *being* the supply whereof God is the Giver;—as Gal. iii. 5, "He [God] that ministereth [*supplieth*] to you the Spirit."

**20.** *earnest expectation*] This graphic word (see Rom. viii. 19) expresses the straining of watchful and *eager looking for* an object—turned in one direction and *away from* all else (ἀπο-; cp. ἀποβλέπειν, ἀφορᾶν, Hebr. xi. 26; xii. 2, &c.).—J.

*in nothing I shall be ashamed*] That is, "**put to shame**" (Vulg., "*confundar*"), scil., by failure. His mission to the capital of the world seems checked by his bonds, and likely to be cut short by death. Yet he trusts it will not be in vain. "My bonds have furthered,—and I am sure their issue, in life or death, will in no point fail to further,—the work of Him Who sent me."

*with all boldness, . . . Christ shall be magnified*] Lit., "**boldness of speech,**" opposed to the silence of one put to shame:—as 1 John ii. 28. After this word would regularly follow, "*I* shall magnify." But the full antithesis to "*I* shall not be *ashamed*" is (not "I shall magnify Christ," but) "*Christ* shall be *magnified* in me."

*by life, or by death.*] By *life*, so long as He preserves me in it:—by *death*, because He enables me to defy it (Chrys.,—so Theodt.).

### 21–24. Balancing between Life and Death.

**21.** *For to me . . . .*] He continues the train of personal reflection begun *vv.* 18–20. "I have joy and assurance, whether I live or die:—*for*, for my own part, to me personally, life promises good things, death better things." The "to me," emphatic by its position, opposes the consideration of *self* to that of *others*, which as he proceeds enters into his thoughts—the "for you" of *v.* 24; and moreover distinguishes it from the "magnifying of *Christ*" in last *v.*

*to live* is *Christ*] In the brevity of this phrase is summed up all the Christian's life in its relation to Christ: the life that is *from* Christ, *with* Christ, *in* Christ, *for* Christ. It conveys even more than the "Christ liveth in me" of Gal. ii. 20; it is the converse and the equivalent of the "Christ is our life" of Col. iii. 4.—"Quicquid vivo, Christum vivo" (Bengel).

*to die* is *gain*] Rather, "**death is gain.**" Of the two infinitives in this verse, the former is *present*, and denotes the *state* of living; the latter is *aorist*, and marks the *moment* of transition to the state beyond.

His present is Christ; his future promises yet more: not indeed more than Christ, but Christ more wholly his—in a union more immediate, more intimate; Christ altogether

Digitized by Google

22 But if I live in the flesh, this *is* the fruit of my labour: yet what I shall choose I wot not.

23 For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better:

24 Nevertheless to abide in the flesh *is* more needful for you.

---

and for ever. While therefore he is willing to live, he desires to die. See note on iii. 11.

Beza's ingenious rendering "To me, both in life and in death, Christ is gain," adopted in some modern Versions, is untenable.

Pagan philosophers, too, could describe death as "*gain*," but on utterly different grounds from St. Paul's. With them, death was gain, as the close of troubles—not as the opening of joy. Cp. Ælian, 'V. Hist.,' IV. 7; Sophocl., 'Antig.,' 463, 464.—J.

Socrates, however (Plato, 'Apolog.', XXXII.), comes nearer to the Christian hope, when in arguing to prove that "death is gain" (κέρδος, as here), he puts forward, not only the negative alternative—that it may be a sleep, but the positive one—that it may open a world of happy communing with the departed great.

**22.** *But if I live in the flesh, this* is *the fruit of my labour: yet* . . . .] To himself, life seems to offer less than death. But as he writes, another aspect of the question arises to his mind. The thought of the services he may render to Christ's people, is to be set against the thought of the joy of being with Christ. Between these he wavers; and the contending impulses, as they find utterance, leave their trace in the broken sentences that follow; imperfect and doubtful in construction, but yielding an insight into his mind and heart than which none deeper is to be gained anywhere in his writings.

The attempt to form the passage into regularity of syntax serves but to efface its character, which is best seen in the literal rendering (as in Vulg., following Old Lat., and followed by Rhem.):—"**But if to live in the flesh, this [is] to me fruit of labour, and what I shall choose . . .**" Thus we see the Apostle (1) viewing the alternative of prolonged bodily life; (2) recognizing therein a prospect of good results; (3) unwilling to decide between life with hope of such "fruit" and death with its assured "gain." (See Note at end of ch.)

*in the flesh* . . . ] "*Life*," the life which (last *v.*) "is Christ," though it be now lived but "*in the flesh*" (cp. Gal. ii. 20), has its hope of "fruit;" as surely as "*death*" (with the life it lays open) has its hope of "gain."

is *the fruit of my labour*] As above, "**is to me fruit of labour;**" that is, "labour *not in vain*" (1 Cor. xv. 58). Bengel's explanation, "The labour itself is the fruit I look for" (genit. of *apposition*), beautiful as it is, seems improbable.

*what I shall choose I wot not*] Better, "I declare not" (γνωρίζω), "I make not known." The intransit. use of this verb (for "*I know*"), though classical, and found sometimes in LXX. (Job xxxiv. 25; Prov. iii. 6), is unknown to St. Paul (cp. iv. 6), and to N. T. universally.—J.

This meaning better suits the dependent verb "*shall* choose," in fut. indic.; for which, after "I *know*," we should expect conj.

**23.** *For I am in a strait betwixt two*] Translate (reading δὲ with best authorities for γὰρ of Rec.), "**Which I shall choose, I say not; but rather I am straitened** (urged by considerations pressing on me) **from both sides**" (lit., "from the two"); scil., the above alternatives, *life* and *death*.

Cp. 2 Cor. v. 8; and see Paley, 'H. P.' VII., vi.

*having a desire to* . . . ]. Lit., "**the desire,**" *i.e.*, "*my* desire." The *wish* he cherishes on *his own* account (as opposed to the *consideration* in next *v.* on *theirs*), tends "*towards*" (εἰς) the place where Christ is.

*to depart*] Lit., "to unloose" (ἀναλῦσαι); of a *ship* (weighing anchor), as Homer, 'Odyss.,' XV., 548; of a *camp* (breaking up), as 2 Macc. ix. 1; so the Latin *solvere*. Being active here, it cannot mean "to *be released* from bonds;" nor (as the Lat. Verss.), "*dissolvi*." Cp. 2 Tim. iv. 6; and see Introd., § IV., D. See also Note at end of ch.

*and to be with Christ*] For similar language concerning the state of the soul immediately after death, cp. 2 Cor. v. 6, 8. But this state, being "partial," relatively to its final or "perfectional" state (Pearson, 'On the Creed,' Art. XII., 6), is elsewhere represented by him as a sleep (1 Cor. xv. 51; 1 Thess. iv. 15).

*which is far better*] Translate (with the best authorities inserting γάρ), "**for it is by much more preferable.**" As if language were too weak to express the superiority, he multiplies comparatives. The Lat. Verss. well render, "*multo magis melius*."—J.

**24.** *to abide in the flesh*] Properly, "**to abide further,**" "**to stay on.**" Rather, "**in my flesh**" (ἐν τῇ σαρκί). Above, *v.* 22, where "flesh" is bodily life *in general*, it has not the art.; here, it is *his own* individual life.—If, with some, we omit the prep., we

Digitized by Google

25 And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith;

26 That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by my coming to you again.

27 Only let your conversation be

---

must translate "to abide *by* the flesh," to hold on to the bodily life.

*more needful for you*] As opposed to "better" of last *v.*—"To be with Christ is more desirable [for my own sake]; my continuance in this body is more necessary **for your sakes.**"

Though their welfare is the consideration expressed, yet Christ's glory (*v.* 20) is in his mind all the while. "Can he hesitate" (Chrys. asks) "to prefer to be with Christ?" "Nay" (he supposes the Apostle to reply), "this too is for Christ's sake; that the servants I have made for Him, I may attach more strongly to Him; that the field I have planted, I may cause to yield Him fruit."

25, 26. HE EXPECTS TO LIVE, AND FOR THEM.

**25.** *having this confidence, I know*] "Being persuaded of (πεποιθὼς) this (that my life is for your welfare), I am sure I shall live."

Some, following Theophyl., render, "This I *confidently* know." But such adverbial use of the particip. is not elsewhere found, and would express merely the *degree* of his assurance. The rendering of A. V., expressing its *grounds*, is better; and agrees with the use of the word in its full participial sense, *v.* 6, and elsewhere.

"I know" (οἶδα), does not imply infallible assurance; St. Paul has shown (*vv.* 20–22) that in this matter he has "only a well-grounded probability." So in Acts xx. 25, where he uses the same verb (Wall, 'Crit. Notes,' *in loc.*—J.).

The foreboding in the latter passage, that he should never return to Asia, and the anticipation in the text, "viewed as infallible presentiments, are hardly reconcilable; for the one assumes, the other negatives, his release. The assurance here recorded was fulfilled (1 Tim. i. 3); while the presentiment there expressed was overruled by events (*ib.*, and 2 Tim. i. 15, 18; iv. 20)" (Bp. Lightfoot). See ii. 24, below; and cp. Philem. 22, where the prospect of release is more faintly expressed by "I hope" (ἐλπίζω,—not "I *trust*," as A. V.) (Wiesinger).—See Introd., § III., *B*, i. (2).

*shall abide and continue with you all*] A. V. (with Rec.) here follows a reading (συμπαραμενῶ) which is well supported. It is better, however, to render (reading παραμενῶ, with best MSS), "**shall abide and abide here, for you.**" He expects to live, and to help them, not only as now, by his letters, but (next *v.*) by his presence.

The compound verb (παραμένειν), is distinguished from the simple as adding to the idea of abiding, that of abiding *in some place* or *with some persons.*

Observe again "you *all*," as above, *v.* 4, &c.

*for your furtherance and joy of faith*] Rather, "**of the faith.**" The meaning is, "in order that you may make *progress* in the faith, and find *joy* in it." This is the "fruit" (*v.* 22), in prospect of which he is, for their sakes, willing to live. "For" points to the end for which he is to abide.—The genitives "your" and "of the faith" relate to both the nouns, which are joined under a common article (τήν,—see Winer, as on *v.* 7).

*joy*] Such as he has in them (*v.* 4, and note), and desires to impart to them.

**26.** *That your rejoicing* . . .] Rather, "**That your glorying** (more accurately, "*matter of* glorying") **may, in Christ Jesus, abound in me,**" &c. Observe the repeated prep., "*in* Christ," "*in* me." The "*in Christ Jesus*," connected immediately with "may abound," yet having relation to the whole thought of the passage, shews Him as the *sphere* in which their "glorying" exists and is to "abound." The "*in me*," placed last, belongs to the whole of what precedes (but more especially to "glorying"), indicating that this joyful confidence, placed in the Apostle as its *object* (cp. 2 Cor. i. 14; v. 12), is to have occasion of increase in his return to them.

This noun (καύχημα), and its cognate words, are variously rendered in A. V. by "*glorying*," "*boasting*," "*rejoicing*." The last is unsatisfactory as an equivalent, failing to express the *confidence* and the *outward expression* of it, which are in the word.

*by my coming to you*] "**By means of my presence with you.**" These words declare expressly what the last *v.* implies,—that he expects not merely to live, and to be released, but also to revisit them; to the increase of their "glorying" (above).

27–30. EXHORTATION TO UNITY IN STEDFASTNESS UNDER PERSECUTION.

**27.** *Only let your* . . .] "Whether I come or not, in my presence or in my absence

Digitized by Google

as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel;

28 And in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them

---

(ii. 12), let it be your care to live worthily of your Christian calling."

Similar admonitions, qualified by the same adverb "worthily" (ἀξίως), occur in two other Epp. written during this imprisonment (Eph. iv. i.; Col. i. 10), and in one to the sister Macedonian Church (1 Thess. ii. 12). But in those the verb is "walk."—J.

*let your conversation be*] Lit., "**live as citizens**" (πολιτεύεσθε). Writing from Rome, whither he has been brought in assertion of his right of appeal as a *citizen*,—to a Roman *city*, where he had (Acts xvi. 37–39) asserted his *citizenship*, he uses this word with manifold fitness. The verb admits of the wider sense of having habits of life, conduct, "*conversation*." So it is used by him in his speech, Acts xxiii. 1 ("I have lived," A. V.), of his *conduct* as a member of the Jewish community. It fitly introduces the ensuing lesson of *unity*, based upon the sense of spiritual *fellowcitizenship*. Cp. iii. 20 (πολίτευμα) and note.

*that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for* . . . .] This is what he hopes to see or hear of them; that they "are stedfast *in the strength of* (ἐν) one spirit," in the unity of spirits that are one in the One Spirit (Eph. iv. 4); and that they "strive as with the energies of one soul," acting harmoniously as of one man (Chrys. well compares Acts iv. 32, "of *one soul*"). In this united "*standing*" and "*striving*," they are regarded as *citizens* joined as *fellowsoldiers* to repel an attack on their city. So below, the second allusion (iii. 20) to citizenship is followed by the same verbs, "*stand fast*," "*strove together*," iv. 1, 3 (στήκειν, συναθλεῖν), neither occurring in this Ep. in any other connection. The military allusion reappears below in "*fellowsoldier*" (ii. 25). He writes to a city which, as a "colony," was a Roman garrison.

For "spirit," "soul," cp. 1 Thess. v. 23. The former is the higher faculty, akin to and receptive of the Divine Spirit; the latter, the vital and active powers.

*striving together*] That is, "**together with one another**," the stress being on the lesson of *unity*. If "together *with me*" were meant, the pron. would be expressed in the Greek,—as iv. 3. "Together with *the Faith*," is an improbable personification: A. V. rightly renders, "*for* the faith" (the dat. being *commodi* not *objecti*).

This "striving" is to be against *persecutors* (next *v.*; also *v.* 30, and last note on it).

**28.** *in nothing terrified by your adversaries*] Lit., "scared," as a startled horse. Who these opponents may have been—Judaizing Christians, hostile Jews, or Gentile oppressors—is not stated. But the hostility here implied is compared, *v.* 30, to that which the Apostle encountered when he first visited Philippi; and was therefore probably an outbreak, as that was, of *heathen* violence.

A different view is advanced by Locke. "There was no party at that time who were in opposition to the Gospel which St. Paul preached . . . but those who were for keeping up circumcision . . . under the Gospel. These were they whom St. Paul apprehended alone as likely to "*affright*" the convert Gentiles and *make them start out of the way* from the Gospel." (Quoted by Peirce.—J.).

(But this note overlooks the presence of the hostile *Gentile* elements which broke out on the occasion referred to).

*which is to them an evident token*. . . .] More accurately, "**seeing that it** (scil., such *fearlessness on your part*) **is a token to them of [their] perdition, but of your salvation**," (with best authorities placing αὐτοῖς after ἐστίν, not before; omitting μέν; and reading ὑμῶν for ὑμῖν of Rec.). The intrepidity of the Philippians will be a presage addressed *to their adversaries* ("them," αὐτοῖς) of the twofold issue; ruin of the one party [supply αὐτῶν], triumph of the other (ὑμῶν). "Be not scared (for *to scare* is all that thay can do). Thus shall you manifest their perdition and your salvation. For when they see that they cannot even scare you, they will perceive a token of their own perdition. For when the persecutors cannot prevail over the persecuted, the vanquishers over the vanquished, shall it not thence be manifest to them that they must perish?" (Chrys.)

Or we may understand the sentence thus: "Be not dismayed by your persecutors, seeing that *their hostility* is of itself the sure presage of their ruin, and (thus) of your triumph." So Dean Vaughan ('Philipp.,' *Lect.* V.), "To fight against Christ, quite apart from the question of its present apparent success or failure, is a sign of ruin to him who is guilty of it." . . . "Opposition to Christ's servants, whatever its immediate result, [is] a mark in itself of *perdition* on the part of the agent, and of *salvation* on the part of the sufferer."

Digitized by Google

an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God.

29 For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake;

30 Having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear *to be* in me.

---

"Perdition," in the utmost and final sense; as also "salvation" (cp. *v.* 19).

*and that of God*] To be connected with "*token*" (not, as A. V. suggests, with "*salvation*.") Their courage will be not a mere *human* assurance of coming victory,—it may, on the contrary, suffer present defeat,—but an "omen" sent by God, of the triumph beyond. Cp. 2 Thess. i. 4–10, where patience under trials is by a cognate word designated as a "token" of their issue.

**29.** *For unto you it is given....*] Better, "**Because to you grace was given**" (ἐχαρίσθη, aor.); scil., when they were first called to be Christians—to *believe* and to *suffer*. The words are confirmatory of last *v.* There, their fearlessness under suffering is interpreted as a presage of salvation; here, another is found in the fact that they suffer *for Christ*. Not only the power to endure, but the trial itself, is a sure token from God of fellowship with Christ now (see iii. 10), of His Glory hereafter (*ib.* 11; Rom. viii. 17).

"To suffer for Christ is a *gift of grace* (χάρισμα), more marvellous than to work miracles, or to raise the dead. For therein I am a debtor; but herein I have Christ for my debtor." (Chrys.)

*in the behalf of Christ....*] Better, "**for the sake of**" (as the same prep. is translated at end of *v.*). The "to suffer for His sake" is resumptive of "for the sake of Christ," which is cut short by the interposed "not only to believe in Him, but also." A. V. here accurately reflects the irregularity of the original.

**30.** *Having the same conflict*] He adds force to his exhortations in *vv.* 27, 28, by reminding them that he has experienced, is experiencing, trials like theirs. The words are thus best construed, as part of the main sentence, with "striving," "terrified,"—the intervening words, "which is to them ... to suffer for His sake," being a parenthesis. Some connect this *v.* with *v.* 29, "Unto you it is given," "having the same ..." (ὑμῖν, ἔχοντες). But this is to be rejected, not on account of the imperfect grammar—such irregularities being far from uncommon—but because the "*conflict*" naturally belongs to the "standing" and "striving" (*v.* 28) as soldiers,—rather than to the subordinate sentence (*v.* 29), which asserts merely the privilege of "suffering."

*ye saw in me*] Scil., on the occasion recorded in Acts xvi. 19, sqq. This incidental appeal to them as eyewitnesses confirms the narrative there (see Introd., § IV., C; and cp. Paley, 'H.P.' VII., vii.). To the shame and suffering of that "conflict" he refers more and expressly, 1 Thess ii. 2, where he describes his Gospel warfare by the same word (ἀγών,—there translated "contention," A.V.). Cp. 2 Tim. iv. 7; and see above, Introd., § IV., D.

It is here implied that the Philippians are now enduring such persecution as that which began in their city in his person (Acts as above); in which probably some of them then shared (see below on iv. 3); and which no doubt had recurred when he wrote (A.D. 57) to the Corinthian Church (2 Cor. viii. 1, 2) of the "affliction" of the "churches of Macedonia."

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on Chap. I.

**1.** *bishops*] In N. T., the use of ἐπίσκοπος as designating an officer of the Church, is peculiar to St. Paul (see the texts above cited); and the word occurs else only in 1 Pet. ii. 25 (of Christ). St. Peter indeed expresses the duty of presbyters by ἐπισκοποῦντες (1 Pet. v. 2); but this use of the *verb* (for which cp. Hebr. xii. 15), is far short of being equivalent to the application to them of the *title* ἐπίσκοποι. Ἐπισκοπὴ however expresses the Apostleship in Acts i. 20 (from Ps. cviii. [cix.] 8, LXX.). Common as the term is in post-apostolic authors, none of them seems to employ it, as St. Paul in every instance does, as synonymous with πρεσβύτεροs, with the single exception of Clement R., who (writing not long before A.D. 100) relates how the Apostles appointed ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους (1 Clem. R., XLII.; cp. πρεσβύτεροι, *ib.* XLIV.). Polycarp (writing probably some twenty years later) enjoins the duty of obedience τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ('Ad Philipp.', V.). The Peshito, alone among the Verss., renders ἐπισκόποις (*in loc.*), "elders," ܩܫܝܫܐ.

The word is used in LXX. for the Hebrew נוגש, פקוד, &c.; see, *e.g.*, Numb. xxxi. 14; Isai. lx. 17 (on which latter text it is to be observed that Clem. R., XLII. as above, in citing it gives for נוגשיך, פקדתך, ἐπι-

Digitized by Google

σκόπους αὐτῶν, διακόνους αὐτῶν, instead of ἄρχοντάς σου, ἐπισκόπους σου of LXX.). Profane writers from Homer downwards, also employ it freely. But no light is cast from either of these quarters on its ecclesiastical usage. Lightfoot, 'Harmony of Evangg.,' Pt. III., on Luke iv. 15, s. IV., regards it as = חזן, a title denoting an officer of the Synagogue: identified by him with the *second* officer, שליח (= ἄγγελος), but regarded by others as an inferior official. (See Bp. Lightfoot, 'Philipp.,' Dissert. I., p. 197.)

*with the bishops and deacons*] This separate mention of the Ministry in saluting the Church, is peculiar to this Ep. Some have accounted for it by supposing them to have been the movers of the bounty of the Church towards him (Chrys., followed by many later writers). Others suggest that he points to their office as a check on self-assertion and consequent divisions, such as he deprecates, ii. 3, &c. (Wiesinger). Some again see in it a mark of the late date of the Ep. But if this implies that in the Churches addressed in earlier Epp. no regular Ministry existed, it is clearly wrong; for in the earliest of them all he writes of "them which . . . . are over you" (1 Thess. v. 12), who are undoubtedly presbyters. His mention of the Second Order (Acts xx. 17), and that of the Third (Rom. xvi. 1), are also earlier than this.—It seems sufficient to say that the presence with him of Epaphroditus,—by whose hand this Ep. was apparently sent, whom he speaks of as a fellow-minister (ii. 25), a member, therefore, of their own body, perhaps their head,—naturally suggested this special greeting to the clergy of the Church. Further, if the view of iv. 3 taken below (see note there) be correct, he has a charge to send to these "bishops and deacons" such as is nowhere else found in his writings, and is thus led to address them in the opening of his Ep.

It is not recorded in Acts xvi. that St. Paul appointed ministers of any order at Philippi. In so short a sojourn, so abruptly terminated, it may not have been possible so to do. Lightfoot ('Harmony of N. T.,' on Acts xvi.) conjectures that when he revisited Philippi (Acts xx. 1-6) he may have thus organized the Church, "which was the course he had used in other Churches, Acts xiv. 21-23." Yet when he wrote his first Ep. to the Church of Thessalonica (but a few months after its foundation), there were already *presiding elders* (as above pointed out) in that Church engaged in their "work," who must therefore have been appointed at the time of his *first* visit.

**8.** *bowels*] Σπλάγχνα (*viscera*), sometimes = the higher internal organs, as distinguished from the *entrails* (ἔγκατα or ἔντερα). (Galen, on Hippocr. 'De Humoribus,' I. 9, reckons as ἡγεμονικὰ among the σπλάγχνα, these three,—*brain*, *heart*, and *liver*.) Hence the use of the word,—not unknown to classical writers, but of specially Hebraic character, like that of רחמים,—for the emotions supposed to reside in these organs as pertaining to man, or even as attributed to God (see Luke i. 78, and cp. *e.g.*, Ps. xxiv. [xxv.] 6):—here, for the tender affections of the Divinely human Heart of Jesus. It is frequent in this sense in St. Paul,—once in 1 Joh. iii. 17. So too in the Apocrypha (*e. g.*, Wisd. x. 5). But the LXX. only once (Prov. xii. 10) give σπλάγχνα for רחמים, rendering the latter by κοιλία or even ἔγκατα, or more usually by οἰκτιρμοί, as A. V. (*passim*) "tender mercies."

**9.** *I pray, that . . .*] Ἵνα is properly = "*in order that*," (implying *purpose* aimed at). But frequently in St. Paul (and elsewhere in N. T., *e g.*, Matt. xxiv. 20; John xv. 8) it tends to pass into the mere "*that*" introductory (as in English) of the following verb in the conj. mood;—here, of the verb that conveys the matter of the prayer (as Vulg. "*oro ut abundet*"); the conjn. and verb expressing only what in many cases might be conveyed by an infinit. So, in modern Greek, ἵνα (reduced to νὰ) is merely the sign of the conj. mood, with which it is used for an infinitive (as, *e. g.*, νὰ ζήσω = ζῆν). See Winer, 'Gr.' Pt. III., § 44, 8; and cp. § 53, 10 (6).

*judgment*] Αἴσθησις (nowhere else in N. T.), properly = "*perception by sense*," "*sensation*";—also of the mind, "*judgment*." The LXX. use it for דעת (= "knowledge," A.V.); *e.g.* Prov. i. 22 (of *man's* knowledge); iii. 20 (of *God's*). We find αἰσθητήρια, Hebr. v. 14, = "*organs of spiritual sense*" (Neander). —J.

**13.** *palace*] This rendering is not only supported by the consent of Greek commentators, and by the parallel expression, iv. 22, —but farther by the fact that everywhere else in N. T., Πραιτώριον denotes a *ruler's residence* (Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; John xviii. 28, 33; xix. 9 [Pilate's house]: Acts xxiii. 35 [Herod's Palace]).

Against it lies the objection, that the Imperial "Palatium" in Rome was not,—nor without shocking Roman feeling could be, —called "*Prætorium*."

To this it is answered that the word, being (as above) freely applied to a *provincial* Governor's residence, is here used, by a provincial writing to provincials, in its familiar provincial sense (Beausobre.—J).

Of the modern interpretations of the word;—(1), the extramural *Camp*, and (2),

Digitized by Google

the Palatine *Barrack*,—both alike labour under the difficulty that it is never so used by any writer, either in its Latin or in its Greek form. Moreover, the expression, "the *whole* Prætorium," excludes (2),—being inapplicable to a place of small extent. But "Prætorium" is commonly employed in Latin to denote (3) the *Prætorian Cohorts*. As among these interpretations, therefore, (3) is to be preferred. It is adopted by Bp. Lightfoot;—see his interesting "Detached Note" on the word. Grimm, 'Lexic. N. T.,' prefers (1).

Yet, the fact that Josephus denotes the Prætorian Cohorts by τὸ στρατηγικόν, not τὸ πραιτώριον, tends to prove that the latter word was not known in the sense of "the Bodyguard" to *Greek* writers (Dean Merivale; see his discussion of the question, 'St. Paul at Rome,' VII., p. 110).

**16, 17.** Some recent commentators following Grotius, take οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας, οἱ ἐξ ἀγάπης, as the subjects of these two *vv.*,—"they that are of factiousness," "they that are of love." (Cp. Rom. ii. 8.) But the ellipsis left by this construction after οἱ ἐξ ἀ. is very clumsy,—as appears especially when *vv.* 16, 17 are restored to their proper order. The usual rendering is therefore to be preferred.

**18.** *Christ is preached* . . .] See on the argument in favour of heretics from this verse, Cyprian, 'Epist.' LXXV., 12 (*Ad Jubaianum*):—also the note in English Translation (Parker's "Library") of same, on the rendering "*annuncietur*" (Vulg., but not Old Lat.), as if from a reading καταγγελλέσθω, which Œcumenius (*in loc.*) alleges to be a heretical corruption of the text.—J.

But it is doubtful whether Œcum.'s meaning is as above stated. And the Vulg. "*annuncietur*" is not meant as imperat., "*Let* Christ be preached,"—but subj., "*Provided* Christ be preached."

**22.** *if I live* . . . .] If the construction is to be completed, it may be (as A.V.,—so Pelagius *in loc.*, &c.) by supplying ["be my lot"], after "in the flesh";—scil., "If I am to live, life will yield me work and its fruit; and thus (or, 'yet') I doubt whether to choose life or death." This sense is satisfactory, but the ellipsis is harsh.

Or, with the great majority of authorities, we may regard "if" as repeated before "this,"—the protasis being thus extended so as to end with "labour."—"If to live in the flesh, —[if] this is to me the condition of fruit of my labour, then (καὶ) I hesitate, &c." ("*if*" being taken as = "since"). Thus the apodosis is introduced by the conjn. (καί), the unusual sense of "*then*" being assigned to it, —of which the instance alleged (2 Cor. ii. 2) is hardly sufficient. To help out this difficulty thus,—"Since life is to me the condition of fruit [I desire not to die], *and*, &c." (Rilliet, *ap.* Meyer,—cp. Wiesinger)—is very arbitrary. The modification of this interpretation suggested by Bp. Lightfoot is better, in which a break in the sense is made after "labour." "What if my living in the flesh will bear fruit . . . ?—In fact, what to choose, &c." But, in any shape, this method of completing the protasis,—reinforcing the subject "to live" by the pronoun "this" with a second "if" inserted before it,—seems too artificial.

Beza's rendering, adopted by many of the Reformed Verss., also by Scholefield, and (in part) by Conybeare, "*An vero vivere in carne mihi operae pretium sit, et quid eligam ignoro,*" makes the sentence regular. But "I know not whether" (οὐ γνωρίζω εἰ), is (1) ungrammatical, and (2) awkwardly linked with "I know not what to choose;" moreover, (3) the sense yielded ill accords with the *certainty* expressed, *v.* 24, of benefit to result. Farther, this interpretation of κάρπος ἔργου, as a Latinism, = *operae pretium* (Grotius), represents the Apostle as thinking of *his own* profit, not (as the context requires) of that of others.—Vulg., &c., give rightly, "*fructus operis.*"

**23.** *to depart*] Origen, according to Jerome ('Apolog. adv. Ruff.', I. 22), explained ἀναλῦσαι here, "*to return*" ("*reverti*"); regarding the soul as being of celestial origin, and death its return home. Tertullian may have meant the same by rendering ('De Patient.,' IX.) "*recipi.*" Cp. Wisd. ii. 1, Tobit ii. 9. C. Bos (*ap.* Elsner), is in favour of this rendering here; but says ἀναλύειν is properly "to return *from a feast*," as Luke xii. 36. See Gataker, 'De N. Instrum. St.,' VII., where four meanings of the verb are distinguished.—J.

In the Latin Vers. of Origen 'In Ep. ad Romanos,' VII. (Jerome), we find the ἀναλῦσαι of this *v.* rendered "*reverti*": in that of his 'De Principiis,' I. 7 (Ruffinus), "*redire.*"

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER II.

1 *He exhorteth them to unity, and to all humbleness of mind, by the example of Christ's humility and exaltation:* 12 *to a careful proceeding in the way of salvation, that they be as lights to the wicked world,* 16 *and comforts to him their apostle, who is now ready to be offered up to God.* 19 *He hopeth to send Timothy to them, whom he greatly commendeth,* 25 *as Epaphroditus also, whom he presently sendeth to them.*

IF *there be* therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies,

2 Fulfil ye my joy, that ye be likeminded, having the same love, *being* of one accord, of one mind.

3 *Let* nothing *be done* through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness

---

CHAP. II. 1–4. UNITY FURTHER URGED: THROUGH WHAT GRACES TO BE ATTAINED.

1. The Apostle proceeds to conjure the Philippians with earnest vehemence, by every Christian motive, to rise into a fuller realization of that *unity* which (i. 27) he hopes to find among them.

*If* there be *therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love*] Rather "**exhortation in Christ,**" "**persuasion of love:**" *i.e.*, "If then mutual exhortation in Christ's name, if the persuasions of mutual love, are realities among you."—Cp. 1 Thess. ii. 11, where the verbs cognate to these nouns are used.

*if any fellowship of the Spirit . . .* ] Scil., of the *Holy Spirit;*—corresponding to "exhortation in *Christ:*" as "bowels and mercies" to "persuasion of love." Thus of the four motives urged, the first and third are *external* and *Divine*—(1) "in *Christ,*" (3) "of *the Spirit;*" each succeeded by one *internal* and *human,*—(2) mutual "*love,*" and (4) the impulses of the *heart* ["*bowels*"]. These are the bonds to join Christian soldiers in unity;—that the Name of *Christ* is a cheering password among them, while *love* heartens them;—that fellowship in the One *Spirit*, as well as the sympathies of *nature*, draw them together. Assuming these to exist among Christians, he grounds on them this appeal.—"If any" (cp. iv. 8), conveys no doubt, but rather means, "*whatever* such motive is among you, act up to it."

Thus they are regarded as exhorting and persuading *one another*. Some understand him as reminding them (as 1 Thess. ii. 11), how *he* had exhorted and persuaded *them*. But the former interpretation, following "Stand fast in one spirit" (i. 27), and leading on to "Be like minded" (next *v.*), seems best to fall in with the train of thought, before and after.

Chrys. understands him to entreat *them* to give *him* "comfort," by cherishing love and unity among themselves.

2. *Fulfil ye my joy*] He expects (i. 25) to abide with them "for *their* joy:" *his* joy they are here in turn bidden to enhance. That joy he has expressed (i. 4) in prayer for their Christian progress, suggesting (i. 27) the spirit of *unity* as especially needed. And this point he now directly presses on them. His *joy* will be *full*, when he sees them *one* in heart.

*that ye be likeminded . . .*] "**That so ye be of the same mind.**" (On the conjn. see Note at end of ch. i., on *v.* 9.) This precept he proceeds to set forth under three heads:—(1) "Having the same *love,*" (united in love not hate); (2) "**Being joined in soul,**" (A. V., "of one accord;" cp. "with *one soul,*" i. 27), by sympathy each with all in all feelings; (3) "Being of *one* mind," (so as not only to think and feel about *the same* things, but *alike* about them).

3. Let *nothing* be done] Better, "[**Being minded in**] **nothing,**"—for this and the next *vv.* relate to *thought and motive*, rather than to acts (cp., "*esteem,*" "*look to,*" &c.).

*through strife or vainglory*] Lit., "according to." Translate, "**In the spirit of factiousness, nor in the spirit of vainglory**" (reading, with best authorities, μηδὲ κατὰ, for ἢ of Rec.). Thus are brought out in distinct articulation the two main heads under which he is about to urge *unity*;—viz., (ii.) *humility* (in this *v.*), and (i.) *regard for others* (next *v.*). To these (in inverse order) he here opposes the two main hindrances to unity,—(i.) "*factiousness*" (see i. 16, note), (ii.) "*vainglory.*"—The spirit that sets (i.) party before charity, or (ii.) oneself above one's equals, is the very negation of the spirit of unity.

*in lowliness of mind*] Lit., "in *the* lowliness . . ." scil., *due* lowliness. The noun here used (ταπεινοφροσύνη), is a N. T. word, nowhere found in LXX., nor in profane writers. See Abp. Trench, 'Synon. of N. T.,' *s. v.*—The "*lowly mind,*" here implied, is the opposite of the "*vainglorious*" *mind*, above condemned.

*esteem other better than themselves*] "**Accounting one another . . .**" (ἀλλήλους). Thus the humility here commended is *between equals* (Theodore Mops.:—cp. his note cited below on *v.* 6).—The verb is the same as "thought" (A. V.) in *v.* 6.—Each is in turn to admit the superiority of others.

Digitized by Google

of mind let each esteem other better than themselves.

4 Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.

5 Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus:

6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

---

Yet no unreal self-depreciation, no over-estimate of one's neighbours, is contemplated. Humility is not to be based on falsehood. But everyone ought to know his own better than others' faults, and to judge them more severely. And no one can fairly view himself and his neighbours without seeing in them some gifts which he is conscious o being without. (Neander.)

**4.** *Look not . . . on his own . . .*] "**Looking to,**"—"having regard to" (particip., not imperat. as Rec.),—connected with "accounting" (last *v.*). Here is the precept of *regard for all men*, opposed to the "*factiousness*," (so sure to narrow into the selfishness of "looking to one's own things" only), which is condemned along with "*vainglory*" in *v.* 3. But a *due* regard for one's own concerns is not forbidden,—only an *exclusive* regard; as appears from "*also* the things of others."

5–8. THE SUPREME EXAMPLE OF THESE GRACES.

**5.** These graces (*unselfishness* and *humility*) which are to cast out the evils that mar Christian unity, are best learnt by contemplating Him, the Centre of that Unity, Who "emptied Himself" in His Incarnation, and "humbled Himself" in His Passion.

Cp. His own words, "*Learn* of Me; for I am *meek* and *lowly* in heart" (Matt. xi. 29;—see also xx. 28). "St. Paul himself *looked to the things of others* rather than *to his own*, (as i. 23, 24); yet here he offers not himself as an example, but Christ." (Bengel.)

**6.** *Who, being . . .*] The Subject of *vv.* 6–8, is "Christ Jesus" (*v.* 5,—anteced. to "Who"): spoken of, in this *v.*, in His pre-incarnate Being:—but afterwards, *vv.* 7–11, in the total of His Divine-human Personality,—suitably denoted by this twofold designation, Divine Title and human name.

*being*] The verb used (ὑπάρχειν), implies *prior* being, and is equivalent to "to be in the beginning" (John i. 1). Thus Suidas explains it,—"to be *before*" or "*of old*." Its tense (imperf.), contrasted with the following aors., points to indefinite *continuance* of being. Translate "**subsisting**";—*i. e.*, "*though* He subsisted," as required by the interpretation below adopted of the closing words of the *v.* [With A. V., the particip. here is to be resolved into "*inasmuch as* He subsisted."]

*in the form of God*] The word (μορφή), here translated "form," though not absolutely equivalent to "essence" or "nature," expresses *that which outwardly manifests the essence or nature*; the *essential attributes of being*, not its accidents. Hence, like other words originally denoting outward and sensible semblance (as ἰδέα, εἶδος, by which Hesychius explains it), it comes to convey the inward reality. Thus, as "image" (εἰκών), Col. i. 15,—and "express image" (χαρακτήρ), Hebr. i. 3—(terms like it drawn from the language of sense), it here denotes a real existence cognizable by thought. Of Him Who "subsists in the form of *God*," the essence is GODHEAD; as surely as one who subsists in the form of *man*, must needs have the essence of manhood. For "it is not possible to be of one *essence* and to have the *form* of another" (Chrys., *Hom.* VI., 3). Cp. "the *form* of a servant" (next *v.*), words which admittedly convey a real manhood. So Chrys. (*ib.* 2), "The *form of a servant*, means *by nature man*; therefore the *form of God*, *by nature God*." The form of a man we perceive chiefly by sense: the form of God solely by the mind. The percipient faculties in the two cases differ; in both alike the being whose attributes are perceived, is real.

"In the form" then,—*i. e.*, the *nature*—"of God, Christ Jesus *subsisted*" before He *became* man (γενόμενος, next *v.*). His Pre-existence is thus affirmed, against the Socinian; and His Godhead, against both Socinian and Arian.

*thought it not robbery to be equal with God*] It will be most convenient to begin with the latter words, "to be equal,"—rather "**to be on equality with God.**" They relate not so much to the *essential* Godhead (already declared in the words "the form of God"), as rather to Its State or Mode. *Equality* is accordingly here expressed not by the adject. masc. sing. (ἴσον), but in an adverbial form (ἴσα), indicating the equal *manner* of His Being rather than the equal Being itself; with the same propriety as is observable in the use of "form" rather than "nature:"—inasmuch as what is here affirmed applies directly only to that outward manifestation of the Divine which He could, and in His condescension did, lay aside, and but indirectly to that which He could not relinquish—His actual Godhead. Yet in the words as they stand, the assertion of that Godhead is none

Digitized by Google

7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the [1] likeness of men:

[1] Or, *habit.*

---

the less distinct because indirect. "Neither *the form of God*, nor *to be on equality with God*, is the Divine Nature; yet He Who *subsisted in the form of God*, and could *be on equality with God*, is God" (Bengel). The words moreover fully sustain the argument which Chrys. grounds on them against the Sabellian heresy of the unity of *Person* in the Godhead; for "*equal* implies more than one person." (*Hom.* VI., 2.)

*thought it not robbery...*] For this rendering (*A*) substitute as follows, (*B*) "**accounted it not a prize . . .**"; *i.e.*, "*Although* He subsisted in the form of God, He did not tenaciously cling to, or eagerly grasp, the being on equality with God" The sentence shows Him in the act of forming the Divine Resolve to lay aside His rightful Attributes of Godhead,—"measuring in calm presage the infinite descent";—and accordingly belongs (as the tense (aor.) of the verb requires) to the narrative of His Condescension, opened in these words, and continued in the "emptied Himself," "humbled Himself" (also aors.), of *vv.* 7, 8.

With the rendering *A* (of A.V.), on the contrary, the words represent Him as upholding His Title to those Attributes; and form part of the declaration of His pre-incarnate State. "*Inasmuch as* He was pre-existent as God, He held it His Right to claim equality of Godhead." This interpretation, in itself most true, and which the words (taken *in themselves*) fairly convey, when viewed *with the context*, proves untenable. For (1) in the *preceding vv.* (3, 4), *lowliness of mind* and *regard for others rather than self*, are the graces to be exemplified; whereas this rendering shews the Lord, in this prominent and emphatic sentence, as asserting His Godhead;—an assertion supremely rightful, yet not fitly adducible as an instance of *self-abnegation* or *humility*. And (2) the *following v.* (7), describing the act by which He "emptied Himself," brings it into the sharpest contrast by the introductory "*But*" (ἀλλὰ, *i.e.*, "but *on the contrary*," as in *vv.* 3, 4), with that which is conveyed by the verb (ἡγήσατο) of this sentence. But "to think it robbery to be equal with God," stands in no such contrast with "to empty Himself." To say "He did not count it a wrongful act to assert Divine Attributes, but *on the contrary* laid them aside," is unmeaning. This defect (disguised to readers of A.V. by the ambiguous "*but*,"—as by "*sed*" to the readers of Vulg.) is admitted by the ablest supporters of the above interpretation, and only remedied by forcing on "but" the meaning "but *nevertheless*."

On the other hand the rendering *B*, above preferred, fully meets the requirements of (1) the *preceding*, and (2) the *ensuing* context, as above indicated. For (1) it furnishes the required example of *self-abnegation* and *humility*; He was not eager to hold, or ambitious to display, the attributes of Godhead that were His: and (2) it supplies the due contrast with the following history of His Self-sacrifice; He did not cling to His Rights, but *on the contrary* stripped Himself of them. The emphatic position of the noun (in the Greek, before the verb), for which *A* shows no reason, is in *B* fully accounted for, as serving to point this contrast.

Of these two rival interpretations, it may be broadly stated (but see Note at end of ch., IV.), that *A* is that of [apparently] the Ancient Versions, and of the post-Nicene Latin Fathers, as well as of popular acceptance;—*B*, of the Greek Fathers, and of modern critics. *A* has been currently preferred, partly as being more obvious on the surface; but mainly, no doubt, because it directly declares the Godhead of the Lord Jesus, which *B* has been supposed to represent Him as declining to assert.

But *B* yields no ground for such misconstruction. On the contrary, by explaining, "He is an Example of self-abnegation, for He did not grasp at or cling to the Attributes of Godhead," *B* conveys as fully by implication, as *A* by express affirmation, that they were rightfully His. For if they were not His,—that is, if He were less than God, to shrink from grasping them would be, as Chrys. (*Hom.* VI., 2) irresistibly argues, no instance of such self-abnegation,—it would merely be to refrain from impious and mad presumption. He is here represented as abstaining from the outward assertion of Godhead, not because it was not His Right, but of His infinite Condescension. In like manner Theod. Mops., who adopts B, with singular acuteness points out that, the "*humility*" to be illustrated (*v.* 3, where see his note cited) being between *equals*, Christ's Humility would have here no application as an Example, were it not assumed that He is *Equal* with the Father. (To somewhat similar effect Chrys. also: *Hom.* VI. 3.) The implied affirmation of Deity herein contained, is all that is to be expected in a passage like this, where the declaration of *What He is*, comes in but incidentally to heighten *His Example*, the immediate matter in hand;—though indirect, not therefore less weighty.



Digitized by Google

8 And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

---

Thus the whole *v.* yields its full meaning as follows:—"Though He was from Eternity God equal with the Father, yet He did not account His Divine State a thing to be tenaciously grasped; but on the contrary stripped Himself of its glories;" a sentence closely parallel with "Though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor" (2 Cor. viii. 9). (See farther, Note at end of ch.)

7. *First aspect of the Lord's Example.*

*But made himself of...*] *I.e.* (see above), "But [*on the contrary*]." This conjn. contrasts the verb ("emptied Himself") of this *v.*, with "accounted" of *v.* 6;—just as the same conjn. contrasts *to be lowly* with *to be vainglorious* (*v.* 3), and *to regard the things of others* with *to regard one's own* (*v.* 4).

*made himself of no reputation*] Lit., "**emptied Himself,**" *scil.*, of the outward tokens of Godhead, in the Incarnation (as the occasion marked by the aor.). A.V. fairly expresses the sense; which is, that He laid aside—not the Essence, which is inalienable, of His Godhead, but—that which is relative to finite perceptions, Its outward manifestation. To affirm that He laid *this* aside, implies that He had it *previously*—for "exinanition supposeth a precedent plenitude" (Pearson 'On the Creed,' II., iii., 25). And to advance this as an example of self-surrender, implies that He had it *rightfully*. In the Greek, the pron. "himself" (ἑαυτόν) is placed emphatically *before* the verb; marking His Example as of negation of *self*, and corresponding to "*his own* things" (τὰ ἑαυτῶν) of *v.* 4.

*and took upon him the form of a servant*] "**In taking upon Him...**" (aor. particip.)—"The form" (as in *v.* 6) implies "the *nature*."—"Servant," rather "**slave,**" correlative to "Lord,"—one whose will is not his own but his lord's. That in taking our flesh, He became in this sense a "slave," was taught prophetically in O. T. (Isai. *passim*, especially xlix. 5, "formed Me *from the womb* to be His *servant*" [**slave,**—LXX., δοῦλον, as here]; Ps. xl. 7, 8, "I *come*, to *do Thy Will*"): and is affirmed by Himself, "I *came* to *do the Will* of Him That sent Me" (John vi. 38). This His surrender of the Will shews the fullest Example of self-surrender in its highest form.

Comparing "the form of a slave" here, with "the form of God," *v.* 6, we can say to heretics on the one hand, "The GODHEAD is as real as the Manhood;" on the other, "The Manhood is as real as the GODHEAD." Marcionists (Chrys., *Hom.* VII., 2), on Docetic grounds, explained away these words as of washing the disciples' feet and suchlike acts of humility. (Pelag. likewise;—but also gives the true sense, "*naturam hominis inducendo.*") So (with an opposite view) modern Socinians explain,—"He took a lowly station among men." This evasion of the natural meaning hardly needs the refutation,—"To *do the work* of a slave is one thing, to *take the form* of a slave is another" (Chrys., as above). The following words unmistakably show that the mere fact of becoming man made Him a slave who is Lord of all (see next note).

*and was made in the likeness of men*] "In becoming," "**in being made**" (again aor. particip.).—"He put aside His Glory of Godhead *in taking* the form of a slave; that form He took *in becoming* man."

"In the *likeness*;" not that He was not *very* man; rather that He was not *mere* man as other men, but more; "not only soul and body, but God and soul and body" (Chrys. as before).—"Of *men*," not "of *man*;" it is not that He *resembled a man*, but that He *represented mankind*. Thus the expression lends no countenance to Docetic error.

8. *Second Aspect of His Example.*

*And being found in fashion as a man*] As the *first* stage of His Example was introduced by the declaration of His antecedent State as God, so these words introduce (by the conjn. "and") its *second* stage, with the description of His State as man when He entered on that stage. To "*subsisting*" (*v.* 6), the verb and tense that fitly convey what He eternally *was*, is here opposed "*being found*," a verb and tense (aor., as the preceding particpp.) that suggest what, in men's eyes, He *became*. Similarly, to "in the *form*," is opposed "in *fashion*" (σχήματι, "*habit*," "outward bearing");—a word used not to derogate from the fulness of the manhood which He took (already implied in "the form of a slave"), but because the matter in hand relates only to what He was by men discerned to be. For the like reason we read "found *as* a man" (not "a man" merely).

*he humbled himself*] Scil., in His Passion (aor., as "emptied Himself"). In it, He shewed the Example of the *humility* enjoined in *v.* 3 ("lowliness of mind"). The verb here used refers us back to the cognate noun there.

Here, the stress is on the verb, which is accordingly placed after (not as the verb in *v.* 7 before) its subject pronoun.

*and became obedient unto death.*] "**In becoming** (as above, *v.* 7) **obedient even unto death.**" The *manner* of His Humilia-

Digitized by Google

9 Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name:

10 That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth;

11 And *that* every tongue should

---

tion is here expressed, as consisting in His Obedience; its *degree*, as measured by the extent to which He obeyed, to the utmost and final point, Death. To *live* as man was self-surrender; to *die* as man was self-sacrifice,—the deepest of humility, the highest of obedience.

*even the death of the cross*] **"Yea, the death..."** His obedience is enhanced by the fact, that He yielded Himself not to mere death, *but* (δὲ) to death in its utmost of horror and ignominy: in Roman eyes, the death of the *slave;* to the Jew, the death of the "*cursed*" (Deut. xxi. 23; Gal. iii. 13).

9–11. HIS REWARD; UNIVERSAL HOMAGE.

**9.** As God, His Humility has been shewn; as man, His Reward is now to be declared. If He were man merely, there would be no lesson of humility in His Death; if God merely, there would be no room for reward in His Exaltation. (Theod. Mops. on *v.* 8.)

*Wherefore God also hath...*] Rather, **"Wherefore also God hath..."** "Also" (*i.e.* "*accordingly*") introduces the result of His Obedience, its Reward. Hitherto the narrative has been of *the Son's* acts: at this point *the Father* intervenes. The glories Christ willingly laid aside are His, in higher fulness of manifestation than ever; not grasped by Him, but bestowed on Him by the Father.

Here is encouragement (according to His saying, "He that *humbleth* himself shall be *exalted*"), to strengthen the lessons of His Self-sacrifice. But on these lessons the Apostle does not dwell. His thoughts have mounted into a higher sphere; and that *unity*, to inculcate which he introduced Christ's Example (*v.* 5), he leaves to be learned from the contemplation of Him as enthroned for universal worship.

*hath highly exalted*] **"Highly exalted"** (aor., omit "*hath*"), scil., in the Ascension. This compound verb is one of singular force; cp. "High throned above all height" (Milton, 'Par. L.,' III. 58). Here is the antithesis to "*humbled Himself*" (*v.* 8).

*and given him a name which is above...*] Here is the antithesis to "*emptied Himself*" (*v.* 7). Translate **"gave Him the Name, that which is above..."** (aor., as last verb; —and art. inserted, with best MSS.).—What "Name"? Not, as many explain, JESUS (for that was given Him "before He was conceived in the womb," Luke i. 31; ii. 21;—note that it is not "the Name Jesus," *dat.*, but "the Name *of* Jesus," *genit.*, in next *v.*). Not JEHOVAH (for that was His from Eternity;—cp. Isai. vi. 1–10, with John xii. 39–41; Joel ii. 32, with Rom. x. 9–13; and see Pearson 'On the Creed,' II., iv., 4–8). Not its equivalent "*Lord*" (for the like reason). Not any appellation or title, but (as "*Name*" so often means) a *manifestation in a certain character or station.* Here, it is the Heirship of all things, the Headship over all to the Church (Hebr. i. 2; Eph. i. 22). So 1 Pet. i. 21, "[God] raised Him up from the dead, and *gave Him glory.*"

**10.** *That at the name...*] Of this Exaltation the *purpose* is, to elicit the homage of all Creation.

*at the name of Jesus every knee should bow*] **"In the Name."** The words do not admit the sense put on them by A.V. (following Beza's "*ad Nomen*":—Vulg., &c., give rightly *in Nomine*"), of reverence done *to* the Name Jesus, even if *that* Name were here meant (see note on last *v.*). They can only signify, *either*, that

(*a*) *Worship* is to be done *to* Jesus ("in the Name," *i.e.*, *in the worship*); as Ps. lxiii. 4, "I will lift up my hands *in Thy Name:*" *or*

(*b*) *Prayer* is to be made *through* Jesus ("in the Name," *i.e.*, *by the mediation*); as John xiv. 13, "ask *in My Name.*"

Of these, (*a*) is to be preferred; for the scope of the whole passage (His Exaltation) requires that He should be here set forth as the Object of Worship rather than as the Medium of Prayer. Thus the meaning is, "Jesus is manifested by God as Head over all; to Him thus manifested, worship is due by all."

*Jesus*] He is designated here by His *human* Name; for as in becoming *man* He humbled Himself, so as *man* He is glorified.

*every knee should bow...*] This passage (*vv.* 10, 11) is formed on Isai. xlv. 23, which is expressly quoted, Rom. xiv. 11. In the Prophet they are spoken by Jehovah of Himself. In this application of them, therefore, to Jesus, we have a proof of His Deity; which is also to be directly inferred from the adoration here claimed for Him, which would be idolatry if rendered to a creature. (Leibnitz, 'Syst. Theol.'—J.)

*of* things *in heaven, and...*] Rather **"beings;"** scil., the universal Creation (cp. Rev. v. 13), in *heaven*, in *earth*, in the



Digitized by Google

confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

12 Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

13 For it is God which worketh

---

*underworld;*—probably (as Theod. M. and Theodt.) the *angels*, the *quick*, the *dead*. So Rom. xiv. 9, "Lord of the *dead* and *living*."

**11.** *And* that *every tongue should confess that* . . .] Thus the homage divides itself into (1) *prayer* to Him (last *v.*), and (2) *praise* of Him, in the confession of His Title as Lord. Translate "**And every tongue shall confess**" (reading with the best authorities, fut. indic., for aor. conj. of Rec.). Thus from the *purpose* (last *v.*) of this manifestation, the writer passes to its *fulfilment*. On the verb, and the corresponding "shall swear" (תִּשָּׁבַע, ὀμεῖται, LXX.,—Isai. as above), see note on Rom. xiv. 11.

"Every tongue," *i.e.*, every creature capable of utterance. A strange misapprehension of these words, as if signifying "every *language*," once led to a happy result. On the strength of them Pope John VIII. sanctioned the reform introduced by Methodius, Archbishop of Moravia (Cent. ix), of using the vernacular Slavonic in the offices of the Church (Neander, 'Hist. of Ch.,' Period IV., 1).

is *Lord*] He condescended to be a "*slave*:" He is owned by the universe as "*Lord*."

*to the glory of God the Father*] Scil., as the supreme end and issue of all. And thus even the Reward of His Course is not for Himself ultimately. His Condescension was for the salvation of men His brethren; His Exaltation is for the glory of God His Father.

12–18. EXHORTATION: ENCOURAGEMENT.

**12.** From the contemplation of His Lord in Glory, the Apostle's thoughts descend to the lessons needed by the Philippian Church. But they do not settle back precisely on the same point whence they arose towards Him. The topic of *unity* is completed; and he now turns to that of *encouragement*, opening with the endearing "beloved."

*Wherefore . . . obeyed*] The advb. refers back to the "*obedience*" of Christ (*v.* 8). "Accordingly, as He *obeyed* and was *exalted*, so persevere ye in *obeying* unto *salvation*."

*not as in my presence . . . absence*] Above (i. 27), they are to "stand fast" in unity, whether he visits them or not: here, to work towards their salvation irrespectively of him; to obey not only in his presence; nay, farther, not merely in his absence *as well as* in his presence, but "*much more*." (The "as" of Rec., though not in Cod. B, is amply supported.)—Thus the lack of his personal influence is to quicken at once their efforts on their own behalf, and their sense of immediate dependence on God. Moreover (as Chrys. adds), it will test whether their past obedience was for his sake or for God's.

*work out*] "Continue to its completion" (implying that the work has been already commenced). "Begun in them" by God, it is to be by *Him* "performed" unto the end (i. 6); yet, as we here learn, by *them*,—for He "works *in them*" (next *v.*).

*your own salvation*] *I.e.*, *for yourselves*; (1) as not depending on me, (2) as enabled by God (next *v.*).

*with fear and trembling*] Words significant of obedience eager not to fail. They occur but thrice in N.T.,—here, 2 Cor. vii. 15, and Eph. vi. 5,—always in relation to *obedience*; as the like expression in O.T., "*Serve* the LORD with *fear*, and rejoice with *trembling*" (Ps. ii. 11;—ἐν φόβῳ, ἐν τρόμῳ, LXX.).

**13.** *For it is God which worketh in you*] Here is (1) encouragement for the "working out" (of last *v.*). "Though I am absent, He is *in* you (not merely '*among* you,' but '*in*' each), to enable you,—yet so as to quicken rather than supersede your own efforts."—Here is also (2) the ground of the "fear and trembling" (*ib.*). The consciousness of the Divine Inworker infuses the element of religious awe into every movement of the Christian life.

In the Apostle's view, there is no opposition between the duty of "working out *one's own* salvation" and the truth of *God's* inworking: between the fact of *freewill* and the doctrine of *Grace*. There is no need to reconcile them; on the contrary, he assigns the latter as the ground of the former ("Work out . . . *for* it is God Which worketh in you"). The assurance of grace working in him is to be the Christian's incentive to exercise his freewill in working.

*both to will and to do*] "**To will and to work**"; same verb (ἐνεργεῖν) as used earlier in the sentence of *God's* "working,"—it means "to work *effectually*" (not "to work *in*"). The change from "*work*" to "*do*" in A.V. obscures the meaning; and Vulg., "*perficere*" actually misleads; as Corn. a Lap. (*in loc.*) points out (substituting Old Lat. "*operari*").

"God works in" us alike in inspiring our *will*, and in enabling us to *work*. In the

Digitized by Google

in you both to will and to do of *his* good pleasure.

14 Do all things without murmurings and disputings:

15 That ye may be blameless and [1]harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom [1]ye shine as lights in the world;

16 Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ,

1 Or, *sincere.*

1 Or, *shine ye.*

---

words of our Article X., closely following Augustine ('De Grat. et Lib. Arb.,' 17), "We have no power to do good works . . . without the Grace of God by Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will"; according to the familiar distinction between *preventing* and *assisting* grace. The explanation of Chrys., "Whenever we have willed, He thereafter increases in us such will," does not reach back far enough to touch the source of the "good will." That of Pelag., as might be expected, falls utterly wide of it: "He works [in us] to will, by persuading and promising rewards." Far otherwise Theophyl., "God will do the whole work; for He it is Who both gives the impulse to will what is good, and brings to pass the doing of it."

*of* his *good pleasure*] Lit., "*for the sake of.*" As the end of Christ's Exaltation is the Father's Glory, so the end of the Christian's salvation is, to fulfil the gracious purpose of His Will.

14. *without murmurings and disputings*] *I.e.*, *against God's Will.* Of the two nouns, the former means "outward complaining," the latter, "inward questioning." The "obedience" required (*v.* 12) must be cheerful, not merely formal.—Some interpret the words of dissensions *among men* (a reversion to the topic of *unity*). But this misses the reference to the example of Israel in the wilderness contained in the words;—cp. with "*murmurings*" (γογγυσμῶν), Exod. xvii. 3, "the people *murmured*" (διεγόγγυζε); see also next *v.* and note. No such *express* mention, as in the parallel passage, 1 Cor. x. 5–11, is here made of the sin and punishment of Israel; because, whereas the Corinthians needed rebuke for actual offences, the Philippians are but to be exhorted, as "children" (next *v.*) against offending (Chrys.).

15. *That ye may be blameless and harmless*] Rather, "**So as to become**" (implying progress towards holier life). The reading of Rec. (γένησθε) is here to be preferred, as better supported, and as more significant than "be" (ἦτε) of A.V. "Blameless" (*in men's eyes*): "harmless,"—rather "**sincere**" (as marg.), lit., "unmixed," thence "pure" (*inwardly*); same word as Matt. x. 16 ("*harmless* as doves").

*the sons of God, without rebuke*] "**Children of God**" (omit "*the*"). The Son of God "*obeyed*," becoming a "*slave*" (*vv.* 7, 8). We who are "*slaves*," if we learn of Him to "*obey*" willingly (*vv.* 12, 14), become "*children* of God." "The slave murmurs (*v.* 14): but what son will murmur, who, when about his father's work, works also for himself?" (Chrys.)—"Without rebuke," better "**unblamable**," slightly differing from "*blameless*," above. (See next note.)

*in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation*] Read "**generation.**" The reference to O.T. is continued. Cp. the same words applied to Israel, Deut. xxxii. 5; still closer in LXX. (οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα, μωμητά, γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη),—"not *His children*, *blamable*, a *crooked and perverse generation.*"

*ye shine as lights in the world*] "**Ye appear**" (φαίνεσθε, not φαίνετε): not "*shine*," as of their own light or for their own glory; but "*appear*," are seen by giving forth God's Light in them. "Lights," properly "luminaries;" the same word as used for the *heavenly bodies*, Gen. i. 16 (LXX.). The added words "in *the world*," suggest that St. Paul may here mean these; so most commentators. But such comparison is surely too high for saints on earth,—meet only for the glorified (Dan. xii. 3; Matt. xiii. 43). He seems rather to have in view *earthly* lights. Cp. the "*light* of *the world*," and the lighted "*candle*," of our Lord's words, Matt. v. 14, 15 (where see Stier); also John v. 35, "He [the Baptist] was the burning and *shining light*," *i.e.*, *lamp*. So Beza here renders "*faces.*" See Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N.T.,' *s. v.*

16. *Holding forth the word of life*] This verb (ἐπέχειν) signifies "extending to others" (food, drink, or the like, so *e.g.* Homer, 'Il.,' IX., 489); and may here, in connection with last *v.*, mean "*displaying* the word of life" (to give to others the "*light* of *life*," cp. John i. 4; viii. 12). Yet the rendering "holding *fast*" (Hesych., *s. v.*, κρατεῖν) seems more suitable to what follows, meaning "persevering until *the day of the end.*"

Either of these is better than the interpretation of Chrys., &c., "possessing," *i.e.*, "seeing that ye possess."

*that I may rejoice in the day of Christ*] Lit., "**For matter of glorying to me against the day . . .**" Above, *their* "glorying" is to be in *him* (i. 26); here, *his* "glorying" is to be finally in *them*. For both, cp. 2 Cor. i.

Digitized by Google

that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.

17 Yea, and if I be [1]offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.

18 For the same cause also do ye joy, and rejoice with me.

19 [1]But I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state.

20 For I have no man [1]likeminded, who will naturally care for your state.

[1] Gr. *poured forth.*

[1] Or, *Moreover.*

[1] Or, *so dear unto me.*

---

14.—"The Day of Christ," as i. 6, 10. *There*, he looks to that Day for the completion of God's work in them; *here*, for the final approval of his own labour bestowed on them.

*that I have not run in vain*] Cp. Gal. ii. 2; also Polycarp, 'Ad Philipp.,' XII. Here, and below, iii. 12–14, we have his familiar metaphor of the footrace, as 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25; 2 Tim. iv. 7. Translate, "**did not run**" (aor.). He conceives himself as at the end of his course, looking back on it.

**17.** *Yea, and if I be offered*] Translate, "**Nay, if even I am poured forth**" (as marg.; so Old Lat., "*libari*"), *i.e.*, as a drink offering. In last *v.*, looking forward to a prolonged life of service, he anticipates the *future* "glorying" of the retrospect at its close. Here, he faces the other alternative, of speedy martyrdom; and is filled with *present* "joy" in the hope of glorifying God by the libation of his lifeblood. The tense and mood (pres. indic.) of the verb, express a vividly realized and proximate contingency;—not (as some explain) a continuous dying daily (as if, "though I *am being* poured forth." Cp. 2 Tim. iv. 6, where the sacrifice, here foreseen as possible, is (by the same verb) announced as imminent: and see Introd., § IV., D.

*upon the sacrifice and service of your faith*] The "*sacrifice*" consists in their "faith" (genit. of apposition), and consequent self-devotion. The "*service*"—or "ministration"—is the act of offering that sacrifice. (For the common art. (τῇ) see note on i. 7.) Some, led by the analogy of Rom. xii. 1, where Christians are besought to "present their bodies a living sacrifice," understand that here the Philippians are themselves the sacrificers. It is better, however, to regard the Apostle as performing the "ministration" (λειτουργία);—cp. Rom. xv. 16, where he speaks of himself as "a minister," "ministering" (λειτουργόν, ἱερουργοῦντα). The words thus convey the image of a priest slain while sacrificing. Accordingly, "*on* the sacrifice of their faith," while he is offering it, his blood is poured forth,—a drink offering, to be the complement of the other. "*On*,"—not merely "*in addition to*" (as drink offerings under the Law were not made alone, but together with offering of food,—Numb. xv. 5-10); but literally "*upon* the sacrifice," according to the heathen custom, of course familiar to the Philippians, of making libation of wine *upon* the slain victim. (Hom. 'Il.,' I., 462; XI., 775.)

Not only the *fact* of his martyrdom, but the *manner* of it—not by stoning, or fire, or the cross, but (as a Roman) by beheading—is here foreshadowed. (Bp. Wordsworth.)

*I joy, and rejoice with you all*] "I have joy in offering my blood, and I share in the joy of the offering of your faith" (see next *v.*). Again "you *all*," as i. 4, &c.

**18.** *For the same cause also do ye . . .*] "**And in the same manner do ye also . . .**"; *i.e.* (as above), "Rejoice in your offering, and share my joy in mine." They are to have not only (as i. 25) *future* joy in his presence, but *present* joy like his own, even in view of death. As their sacrifice and his libation are conceived as mingling on the altar, so are his joy and theirs to meet over the joint offering. —Some translate the second verb in both sentences (συγχαίρειν) "congratulate." But this is less suitable to the earnestness of the passage than A.V., for which cp. 1 Cor. xii. 26.

19–24. HE HOPES TO SEND TIMOTHY, AND HIMSELF TO FOLLOW SHORTLY.

Turning now to the more ordinary topics of a letter, he informs them of the intended mission of Timothy, and return of Epaphroditus.

**19.** *But I trust . . .*] The connection is "[How it may be with me, or with you, I know not], *but* [meantime] I trust (accurately, "**I hope**") the Lord will grant me soon to hear of you through Timothy." For "in the Lord," see *v.* 24 and note. For the mention of Timothy, see note on i. 1.

*that I also may be of good comfort*] "**I hope to send Timothy, in order that** [as you will be cheered by the tidings of me given in this letter, and by his report of my welfare, so] **I too may be cheered, when I learn your state** [from him on his return]."

**20.** *For I have no man likeminded*] Scil., "**none** [**else**] **likeminded** [**with me**];" lit., "*of equal soul*" (ἰσόψυχον,—cp. Ps. liv. [lv.] 14 [13];—also Deut. xiii. 6, LXX.), *i.e.*, "of congenial soul," "of kindred nature" (as child with parent see next *v.*); stronger than

Digitized by Google

21 For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's.

22 But ye know the proof of him, that, as a son with the father, he hath served with me in the gospel.

23 Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me.

24 But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly.

---

"*joined in soul,*" (σύμψυχοι) of *v.* 2. In Timothy he found a second self,—"*Paulus alter Timotheus*" (Bengel). Some take the word to mean "like-minded with *him*" (Timothy), thus missing the reference to the *filial* relation, next *v.*

Observe in what this congeniality lay. "St. Paul knew what it was to crave for sympathy . . . [But] it was not because he missed something on which self might rest . . . The sympathy he sought was a sympathy in his work for Christ." (Dean Vaughan, *Lect.* X.)

*who will naturally care* . . .] Lit., "**such as will** . . ." (ὅστις, indicating *how* Timothy was qualified for the mission). "Naturally" (γνησίως), *i.e.*, "with natural, trueborn, genuine affection," such as mine; therefore such as "mine own son" (1 Tim. i. 2, γνήσιον τέκνον) will feel. For full tidings of them he can trust none but *him*, who by virtue of a soul congenial with his own in care for their souls, and of former association in his work among them, is fitted to learn and to report all that he longs to know.

**21.** *For all seek their own* . . .] "**All of them,**"—*i.e.*, all the rest (all save Timothy), prefer their own interests to Christ's cause. We infer, therefore, that of his truest followers (Col. iv. 10–14; Philem. 23, 24), Timothy only was with him when he wrote this; as at a later date "only Luke" (2 Tim. iv. 11). *He*, "the beloved physician," at all events, cannot be supposed to be included in such an estimate as this. None of those followers is named in the closing salutations (see Introd., § III., B, i. (3)). There, he in his charity calls those that are about him "brethren" (iv. 21); but here we perceive that he discerns with pain, that self seeking is universal among them. This knowledge may perhaps have suggested his precept to the Philippians, "Look not every man to his own things" (above, *v.* 4).—Yet, notwithstanding this heavy aggravation of his troubles, he purposes to part, for their sakes, with this one unfailing companion and friend, and (*v.* 25) with his welcome and devoted visitor Epaphroditus;—and still he can "*rejoice*"! In the mouth of one stript so bare of human comfort, there is deep truth in the phrases, "I hope *in the Lord*"; "I trust *in the Lord*"; "Stand fast *in the Lord*"; "Rejoice *in the Lord*" (*vv.* 19, 24; iii. 1; iv. 1; *ib.* 4).

**22.** *But ye know the proof of him*] "*The rest* are self-seeking; but *he*, as you saw when he was among you with me, was tried,—and you know what he then proved himself to be." See Introd., § IV., C; and cp. Paley 'H. P.' VII., iv.

*that, as a son with the father, he hath served with me in* . . .] Rather, "**how, as child to father, he served with me towards** . . ." (aor.; scil., at the time of their sojourn in Philippi). The slight want of correspondence between the two parts of the sentence, reflects accurately the twofold relation between the men. To *one another*, they were "as child *to* father;" to *God*, they were alike servants, one "serving *with*" the other. "Concinne loquitur, partim ut de filio, partim ut de collega." (Bengel.)

**23.** *Him therefore I hope to send*] "Therefore," *i.e.*, because thus fit. The qualities that so fitted him would, to a less unselfish spirit, have seemed reasons why he could not be parted with; to St. Paul, they are reasons for sending him.

*to send presently*] *I.e.*, "**forthwith**" (which is what A. V. means by "*presently*"); stronger than "*shortly*" (*vv.* 19, 24). Probably in thus writing he anticipates an early decision of his appeal ("so soon as I shall see *how it will go with me*"), resulting in his release. Tidings of this he hopes to send by Timothy "shortly" (*v.* 19)—yea "*forthwith*," and himself to follow "shortly" after (*v.* 24).

**24.** *But I trust in the Lord* . . .] Above (*v.* 19), of the sending of Timothy—a matter, humanly speaking, in his own hands (for Timothy was not in prison)—he says, "I *hope* to send": here, he expresses his prospect of revisiting them, an event beyond his own power to effect, by the far stronger verb, "I *trust*." But the *purpose* he "*hopes*" to fulfil, the *confidence* in which he "*trusts*," here as in *v.* 19, are both alike "*in the Lord*." "Behold how he makes all to hang upon God!" (Chrys.) This anticipation of liberation is expressed, Philem. 22, by the fainter word, "I *hope*." Above, by the more decided "I *know*" (i. 25, see note). These variations of expression image the phases of hope, trust, and assurance, through which his mind passes:—but hardly furnish safe ground for conclusions concerning the order of priority among the Epp. of this period. See Introd., § III., B, i. (2).

Digitized by Google

25 Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, and fellow-soldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants.

26 For he longed after you all, and was full of heaviness, because that ye had heard that he had been sick.

27 For indeed he was sick nigh unto death: but God had mercy on

---

25–28. HE WILL SEND EPAPHRODITUS BACK.

**25.** *Yet I supposed it necessary to send . . .*] "**But I account it necessary . . .**", *i.e.*, obligatory as *a duty;* not a *voluntary* matter, as the sending of Timothy. The tense of the verb is the "epistolary aorist," used to mark the time which, though *present* to the writer, will be *past* to the reader (so, "I *sent*," *v.* 28); and is thus equivalent to the present tense required by the English idiom. The connection is, "To send Timothy, or to visit you myself, may or may not be practicable; *but* what I can and feel bound to do, I do now,—I send back your messenger."

Of Epaphroditus we only know what we gather here and from iv. 18 (and perhaps also iv. 3—see note there),—that he was deputed by the Philippian Church, of which he was a member and apparently a minister, to carry to Rome a contribution to the relief of the Apostle; that for the Apostle's sake he stayed there at great personal risk; that he fell sick and had nearly died; that he has recovered and is longing for home; that he is now being sent back accordingly; and that (as is clearly implied) he bears this Epistle. The name "*Epaphras*," of Coloss. (i. 7; iv. 12) and Philem. (23), is a shortened form of this; but both are too common to warrant us in identifying the persons.

*my brother, and companion in labour, and fellowsoldier*] These three terms (joined under one art.,—see i. 7, note) describe what St. Paul has proved him to be,—(1) a fellow *Christian*, (2) a fellow *worker in the Gospel*, (3) a fellow *combatant in a common warfare* amid perils. The second, here as iv. 3, and usually in St. Paul, seems to denote one associated in the ministry.

*but your messenger, and he that ministered . . .*] On the other hand, these two terms express what they had sent him to do. "[Such I, on my part, found him;] **but** (δὲ) [on your part, he was sent to be] **your messenger and [your] minister to my need**" (cp. iv. 16). "Your," standing first in its clause, is emphatic, and relates to both the following nouns.

Here we have the first *express* reference to the contribution sent by the Philippians. Cp. i. 5, and note; and Paley, 'H. P.,' VII. i.

Theodt., followed by some writers of authority, interprets the former noun (ἀπόστολον), "Apostle," *i.e.*, presiding *Bishop*. But the true meaning is evidently as above given. Cp. "*the messengers* (ἀπόστολοι) of the Churches," 2 Cor. viii. 23. At the same time, on other grounds (for which see note on "yokefellow," iv. 3), it seems highly probable that Epaphroditus was Chief over the "bishops" (i. 1) of Philippi.

The latter noun (λειτουργόν), and also its cognate, "service" or "*ministry*" (λειτουργία, below, *v.* 30), both of *sacrificial* import (cp. *v.* 17), perhaps indicate that their benefits are regarded by him as *offerings to God:*—as below, iv. 18.

**26.** *For he longed . . . was full of heaviness*] Lit., "he *was longing*," *i.e.*, in our idiom "**he is longing**"; the tense modified for same reason as "**I account**," in *v.* 25,—but here impf. instead of aor., as denoting a *continued* state.

Of these two verbs, the former (cp. i. 8) here conveys the *craving* desire to see again absent friends. The latter (same as used, Matt. xxvi. 37, to express the distress of the soul of Jesus,—A. V., "to be very heavy"), whether derived from an adj. (ἄδημος) meaning "away from home," or from an advb. (ἄδην), "uneasily,"—conveys the yearning of heartsickness, such as absence from home, especially when aggravated by illness, engenders. This feeling would be intense in one who knew his sickness and absence to be matter of anxiety to friends at home. How truly is all this indicated in these few words!

On the intercommunication here implied between Rome and Philippi, see Introd., § III., B, i. (5).

**27.** *God had mercy on him*] Though for himself he counts that "death is gain" (i. 21), he acknowledges the spared life of his friend as of "mercy": and enters into the natural feeling of thankfulness for restored health.

*on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow*] "I too have a share in the mercy shewn him; for, had he died, that would have been a sorrow added to the sorrows that fill my life." Note, that there is no hint of exerting miraculous power to heal his friend, a power not given for personal ends. (Paley, 'H. P.,' VII. ii.)

Digitized by Google

him; and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow.

28 I sent him therefore the more carefully, that, when ye see him again, ye may rejoice, and that I may be the less sorrowful.

29 Receive him therefore in the Lord with all gladness; and [1]hold such in reputation:

[1] Or, *honour such.*

30 Because for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life, to supply your lack of service toward me.

---

**28.** *I sent him therefore the more carefully*] **"I send him** (for tense see *v.* 25, note) **more promptly** [than I should otherwise have done]," scil., because of his illness, your anxiety, and his homesickness.

*that, when ye see him again, ye may rejoice, and . . .*] Rather, **"ye may again rejoice."** "To welcome him back will be, to you, *restored joy;* to me, *relief in part from sorrows.*" Observe here, (1) the strength of sympathy implied,—the removal of their anxiety removes from him a sorrow: (2) the consciousness that sorrows are his portion (see last *v.*),—so that though this or that sorrow be removed, the life of sorrow remains for him: (3) the joy that co-exists with the sorrow, and shines through it everywhere in this Ep.; cp. 2 Cor. vi. 10, "*sorrowful* yet alway *rejoicing.*"

29, 30. COMMENDATION OF EPAPHRODITUS.

**29.** *Receive him therefore in the Lord*] "Welcome him, not merely with human joy; but as one who has done Christ's work, and is restored to you by His Grace."

*with all gladness*] **"With every joy,"** —joy on every ground,—for the peril encountered, the spirit shewn, the service done.

**30.** *Because for the work of Christ he was nigh . . .*] Rather, **"he came nigh."** The words, "of Christ," are very doubtful, the authorities giving various readings ("of Christ," "of the Lord," &c.). Probably they all are insertions to explain "the work." It is therefore best to omit them, with Tischendorf (following Cod. C), and to render **"for the work's sake."** So "*the work*" is used, Acts xv. 38, "where we seem to have St. Paul's very words" (Bp. Lightfoot). "The work" is, of course, the furtherance of the Gospel (cp. Acts xiii. 2);—in this case, by ministrations to its chief Minister. This is more probable than to suppose Epaphroditus to have "worked" in preaching it in Rome.

He says "for *the work's* sake," not "for *my* sake;" regarding the service as rendered less through personal attachment, than for the cause of Christ. (See last note on *v.* 25.)

*not regarding his life*] Lit., "*consulting amiss for his life*" (παραβουλευσάμενος, so Rec.).—The more probable and better supported reading (παραβολευσάμενος,—neither verb occurs in any other author) means **"hazarding,"**—as an appellant staking a *pledge* (παραβόλιον), to be forfeited in case he lost his cause. "In the Apostle's *appeal,* Epaphroditus put as it were his *own life* in *pawn* for him" (Bp. Wordsworth). Hence the title of the "Parabolani" of later times; a fraternity, not unlike the *Frati della Pietà* of the modern Roman Church, who undertook the *hazardous* office of visiting the sick and burying the dead in time of pestilence (Bingham, 'Antiquities,' III. ix.). (See Note at end of ch.)—The danger incurred by Epaphroditus was his *sickness,* brought on or aggravated by his assiduous personal attendance on the Apostle: of *persecution* we have no hint.

*to supply your lack of service . . .*] Rather, **"that which was lacking on your part of the service."** Cp. 1 Cor. xvi. 17. He does not reproach them as having neglected him in the past: he but refers to that part of the required "service" (scil., personal ministrations), which they did not—because, being absent, they could not—render directly, but indirectly through Epaphroditus. "Your city was not present with me; yet it rendered me every service, by sending him." (Chrys.)

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on CHAP. II.

**6.** *thought it not robbery . . .*] Farther discussion of Interpretations *A* and *B.*

### I. OBJECTIONS ON EITHER SIDE.

(*A*). *Objections against A.*

(1) Sufficient stress has hardly been laid on the *tense* of ἡγήσατο. *A* would properly require ἡγεῖτο (imperf.), to make good the connection with ὑπάρχων (which on this interpretation is=ἐπειδὴ ὑπῆρχε). Or rather, seeing that the affirmation of Godhead is but incidental, introduced to heighten the coming statement of the Condescension, we should expect, ἐν μ. Θ. ὑπάρχων, οὐδὲ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγούμενος τὸ εἶναι . . .

Digitized by Google

(2) It is to be observed that "*to be equal with God*" (a *state*), cannot properly be spoken of as a "*robbery*" (an *act*).

(3) For the objection that the true force of ἀλλὰ (in *v.* 7) is reversed by *A*, see above. Waterland combats it ('Sermons,' V.), by alleging sundry instances of ἀλλὰ for ἀλλ' ὅμως in N. T. But in all these the conjn. proves on examination to retain its proper *adversative* force.

(*B*). *Objection against B.*

On the meaning given by this interpretation to ἁρπαγμός, a serious question arises. The analogy of like verbal nouns in -μός would impose on it an *active* meaning,—an "*act of seizing*," a "*robbery*," as in *A*; not a "*thing seized*," a "*prize*," as *B* requires. The latter would properly be ἅρπαγμα. And the phrase ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι (ποιεῖσθαι, and the like), = "to regard as a prize," "to hold or grasp eagerly," is not uncommon in Greek authors;—see the examples given by Bp. Lightfoot and other commentators, *in loc.*—The word ἁρπαγμὸς is rare;—once only in a profane writer,—Plutarch, 'De Liberor. Educat.,' 15, where it has its proper active sense. It also occurs once in Eusebius, 'Comment. in Luc.,' VI.;—once in Cyril Alex., 'De Adorat.,' I. 25; and once in a passage in the 'Catena Possini,' on Mark x. 42;—in all of which cases it is used as = ἅρπαγμα, in the two former with ποιεῖσθαι (Bp. Lightfoot; cp. Meyer, who vainly attempts to give his *quasi-active* sense—below, III., (1)—to ἁρπαγμὸς in these passages). These three, however, can hardly be relied on as independent instances, being from Christian writers who probably adopted this use of the word from the text in question,—which is interpreted (as in *B*) with ἁρπαγμὸς in the *concrete* sense, by Euseb. ('Ecl. Pr.,' III. 8; 'Eccl. Th.,' I. 13), and by Cyril A. ('Contra Jul.,' VI.; 'In Esai.,' IV. 4). We have not therefore sufficient grounds *of usage*, on which to decide whether the word admits of this sense. But we have the analogy of many similar verbal nouns, which, though properly denoting *an action*, have come to mean the *result of such action*,—the abstract meaning readily passing into the concrete;—*e.g.*, θεσμός, χρησμός. Of this the N.T. affords a striking instance in θερισμός,—properly, the *act* of (or *season* for) reaping (so, *e.g.*, Matt. xiii. 30);—thence the *corn* to be *reaped* (Matt. ix. 38, ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς; Rev. xiv. 15, ἐξηράνθη ὁ θερισμός). Other languages shew a like tendency to a decline in precision as to the use of such words. So in English, a "capture," a "seizure,"—properly the *act* of taking, or seizing, are used for the *thing* taken or seized. So too the Latin "*rapina*," below, IV. (i.).

On the whole therefore we conclude that the difficulty as to the use of ἁρπαγμὸς is not so grave as to hinder our deciding in favour of interpretation *B*.

## II. Misconstruction of *B* to be guarded against.

The phrase οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο is however by no means equivalent to οὐχ ἥρπασε. The Apostle speaks not of the Lord forbearing to *do* an *act*, but of the estimation in which He *regarded* a *thing*, as the preceding *vv.* require (with ἡγήσατο cp. ἡγούμενοι, *v.* 3). It is not "He *did not seize* equality with God,"—as Arius (*ap.* Chrys., *Hom.* VI., 2), and many moderns, misconstrue it; as though He forbore to grasp what, as not being His own, He had no right to. It has been already shewn that the context excludes such meaning (see above, Chrys.'s argument on this point).—For a like reason the explanation of ἁρπαγμὸς as "res *rapienda*" is hardly admissible, unless so modified as to mean,—not a "thing *to be seized*" (as if it were not already His), but—a "thing to be *clung to*." The word is rather = "res *rapta*," a "*prize*"; a thing either (as above) to be (1) tenaciously *held* (as plunder by a robber), or to be (2) boastfully *displayed* (as spoils by a victor). The full significance of the context as developed above, seems to require *both* shades of meaning. But of the two, the former (1) stands first, and is the more prominent.

## III. Intermediate Interpretations.

Between the rival interpretations *A* and *B*, though (as above shewn) not merely distinct but opposite, some have attempted to find a compromise which shall avoid the difficulties of both.

(1) Of such attempts one only seems to give a truly intermediate result; that of Meyer, whom Alford follows. He regards the sentence οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, as in *B*, as introductory to the narrative of Christ's Course, referring it to the point of time when He was about to come into the world; but retains an active meaning in ἁρπαγμὸν, by rendering, "He did not consider it under the point of view of making booty,"—"regarded it not as self-enrichment" (Alford),—and explains, "Had he then thought, When I shall have come into the world I will seize to Myself, by means of My equality with God, power and dominion, &c.,—then He would have acted the part of ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι." The meaning then is, that He did not think fit so to use that equality, but on the contrary chose the part of self-renunciation.

This explanation certainly satisfies (as *A* fails to do) the requirements of the context, while it in some measure avoids the difficulty as to ἁρπαγμὸς (which attaches to *B*). Yet the meaning assigned by Meyer to that word

Digitized by Google

is at best but quasi-active, and differs considerably from its proper meaning—an "*act* of seizing." Nor does his rendering bring out the required contrast to the subsequent "emptied Himself," by any means so simply or forcibly as the more obvious "He counted it not a prize." Further, he takes no account of the probability that the sense of expression is the same as that of the closely similar ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι.

(2) The interpretation of Chrys. (*Hom.* VII., 1; 'Contr. Anom.,' X.) followed by Theophyl. and Œcum., has been regarded as of an intermediate character. It is briefly thus:—What one has of *right*, one does not so greedily grasp, as what one has taken by *usurpation*. A slave elevated to dignity, a tyrant who has seized a kingdom,—is more tenacious of it than a son born to an inheritance, a king seated on an ancestral throne. The Son of God, accordingly, did not cling to His Prerogatives of Godhead as one would do who had wrongfully usurped them, but on the contrary stripped Himself of them all.

But that Chrys. (as above) here takes ἁρπαγμὸς in the concrete sense, appears from his words,—Ἥρπασέ τίς τι, τοῦτο κατέχει διαπαντός,—Ὁ ἁρπάσας τι, κατέχει τοῦτο διηνεκῶς.—Isidor. Pelus., who gives ἑρμαῖον and ἅρπαγμα as equivalents for ἁρπαγμὸς here (*Epist.*, IV., 22), explains exactly as Chrys. does, using his illustration of the slave raised to rank. Cp. also Theodt.'s similar comment. Thus the interpretation of Chrys., which would stand equally well if ἅρπαγμα were read in the text for ἁρπαγμόν, is not really intermediate, but merely a form of *B;* its peculiarity lying mainly in the explanation it suggests of the origin of the idiom ἁρπαγμὸν [ἅρπαγμα] ἡγεῖσθαι.

### IV. Authorities on either side.

(i.) *The Versions.* Stress has been laid on the alleged fact that all the Ancient Versions (except the Arabic) adopt *A.* But the evidence yielded by some of them proves when examined to be inconclusive. As to the Vulg., the word "*rapina*" by which it (after Old Lat.) renders ἁρπαγμός, is ambiguous,—being in it frequently used as="*præda.*" [Similarly in Martial,—*e.g.*, "mollem frangere . . . . *rapinam*,"—'Epigr.,' I., cv., 19.] So we find "*rapina*," Isai. iii. 14 (LXX., ἁρπαγή); *ib.* lxi. 8 (LXX., ἁρπάγματα): where the corresponding Hebrew words גזל, גזלה have likewise the double meaning of (1) the *act*, (2) the *thing* seized. The same is true of the Syriac rendering, ܚܛܘܦܝܐ (here,[1] and in both the above texts of Isai.). Moreover it appears that some Latin writers, *e.g.*, Jerome (see below ii. (2)), with this rendering "*rapinam*" before their eyes, yet adopted *B;* and must therefore have understood "*rapina*" as=*præda.* Neither from the Latin nor from the Syriac Versions therefore can any sure inference be drawn.[2] The remaining Verss. may perhaps be found to be similarly indecisive. Probably the translators, finding before them an idiom that was strange to them, were content to render it verbatim, and to leave the interpretation open.[3]

(ii.) *The Fathers.* Waterland, in the Sermon above cited, in defending rendering *A*, asserts that it has the countenance of "the Greek and Latin Fathers from the fourth century downwards,"—or (he adds) "after the Nicene Council." Bp. Lightfoot, on the contrary, writes, "While this interpretation is most common (though not universal) among Latin writers, it is unsupported by a single Greek Father, unless possibly at a very late date."

(1) As regards *Greek* authorities, the former of these statements is certainly erroneous; to the latter, there is at least one signal exception. Athanasius, 'Contr. Arian.,' *Orat.* III., 6, writes as follows: Ὅλος Θεός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἴσα Θεῷ ὢν οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ,—where the words are indubitably taken, as in *A*, as part of the statement of Christ's antecedent greatness. The words of Basil also, from which Bp. Lightfoot says (p. 133, note), "nothing can be inferred," seem to be unmistakably on the same side. Ὁ οὖν Υἱός, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγούμενος τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, πῶς ἀνόμοιος καὶ ἄνισος Θεῷ; ('Adv. Eun.', IV.)

Even after these deductions, however, the mass of Greek authority against the rendering *A* is very great; and in a matter which turns on a question of Greek language, ought to outweigh a unanimous consent of Latin writers, were such forthcoming. First

[1] Grotius puts forward the singular idea that we have here a Syriac idiom, which he finds in the words ܠܐ ܐܚܘܕ ܚܛܘܦܝܐ in the Liturgy of Severus, rendered by Fabricius "*non assumam rapinam.*" Against this, it is to be observed (1) that *assumere rapinam* is far from being equivalent to ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι (however interpreted); (2) that this rendering of ܚܛܘܦܝܐ, *robbery* (as if= גזל), is wrong—its proper meaning being *flame*; and the above words from the Ritual being correctly translated (Assemani, II., p. 270), "*non apprehendam flammam;*" (3) that the Syriac Translators fail to recognize any such idiom, but render ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, ܚܛܘܦܝܐ ܚܫܒܗ.

[2] The like ambiguity appears to attach to the Coptic, ϩⲱⲗⲉⲙ (Bp. Ellicott).

[3] The modern Versions, with the signal exception of Luther's ("*hielt er es nicht für einen Raub*") adopt *A*.

Digitized by Google

in order of time is the oft-cited passage (ap. Euseb., 'H. E.', V. 2), in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (A.D. 177), where the martyrs are said to be imitators of Him Who οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, these words being undoubtedly used as in themselves expressing His self-surrender. We find the same interpretation in Origen (*e.g.*, 'In Joh.,' VI., 37); and (as above shewn) in Euseb., Chrys., Theod. Mops., Theodt., Isidor Pelus., and Cyril A.;—also (of later writers) in Œcumen. and Theophyl. (Other references will be found in Bp. Lightfoot, p. 132.) Thus the chain of authorities, contrary to Waterland's assertion, reaches from the second century to the eleventh; and is as strong after the Nicene Council as before it.

(2) As regards *Latin* writers, Waterland's statement is substantially correct. After the date A.D. 400, there seems to be absolute unanimity in favour of the interpretation apparently required by the Vulg. rendering of the text, and previously adopted by Tertullian (see the citations in Waterland).

Opposed to *A*, however, a few Latin authorities are to be found;—of the third century, Novatian; of the fourth, Hilary of Poitiers, and Jerome (see the passages cited by Waterland, and by Bp. Lightfoot, p. 134).

(3) A survey of the names of Greek and Latin Fathers on both sides, as given above, may satisfy the theologian that, doctrinally, either interpretation (as Waterland says) "will suit very well with Catholic principles," though "the latter [*B*] only can be any way drawn to favour the Arians." Anglican authority is divided on the question. Against the name of Waterland on the side of *A*, may be set that of Bp. Bull, who, adopting *B*, affirms of this text, that it alone is sufficient to confute all heresies against the Person of our Lord ('Def. Fid. Nic.,' II. *c.* 2, § 2). For confirmation of this assertion, read the masterly series of arguments, drawn from the text so interpreted, with which Chrys. overwhelms, one by one, the manifold forms of heresy by which the Truth of that Divinely Human Person had, up to his time, been assailed (*Homm.*, VI. . . . VIII.); and cp. the brief summaries of the same, given by Theodt., Œcumen., and Theophyl.

[For a very full and able monograph on this passage, see J. J. Gurney's 'Notes and Dissertt.,' No. 7.—J.]

**30.** *not regarding his life*] The Vulg. rendering, "*tradens animam suam*," is not very intelligible. That of the Latin translator of Theod. Mops. is better, "*in incertum tradens*,"—apparently representing παραβολευσάμενος; as does the Old Lat., "*parabolatus de anima*."

## CHAPTER III.

1 *He warneth them to beware of the false teachers of the circumcision,* 4 *shewing that himself hath greater cause than they to trust in the righteousness of the law:* 7 *which notwithstanding he counteth as dung and loss, to gain Christ and his righteousness,* 12 *therein acknowledging his own imperfection.* 15 *He exhorteth them to be thus minded,* 17 *and to imitate him,* 18 *and to decline the ways of carnal Christians.*

FINALLY, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed *is* not grievous, but for you *it is* safe.

CHAP. III. 1–3. DIGRESSION: WARNING AGAINST JUDAIZERS.

**1.** *Finally*] Lit., "for the rest." This phrase (as iv. 8) implies a summing-up of remaining topics, with a view to concluding. The Apostle is apparently about to close; but fresh matter arises to his thoughts, and causes the digression which occupies this chapter.

*rejoice in the Lord*] He has spoken of their "joy" in himself, and in the promised return of Epaphroditus (i. 25; ii. 18; *ib.* 28, 29). Now once more he bids them "rejoice," adding "*in the Lord*",—cp. i. 26; ii. 29. By such iteration (cp. iv. 4) he means to enforce this main lesson of "rejoicing," and "in the Lord," before he concludes.

*To write the same things. . .*] "To repeat this exhortation, *Rejoice in the Lord*, to me is not tedious" (lit., "slothful," or "causing weariness").—"For you it is safe," *i.e.* as imparting certainty, precluding mistake. This sense of the adj. (ἀσφαλής), in which it is used wherever found in Acts (xxi. 34; xxii. 30; xxv. 26), best suits the context here. Thus the connection is with the sentence just before—"the same things" being the reiterated calls to "rejoice."

This explanation, (*a*) (Bengel, &c.), seems more natural than any of the others proposed: such as, (*b*) "to repeat the same [exhortations to *unity*]," referring to ii. 2 (Bp. Lightfoot); or, (*c*) "to write the same things [as I have written *to others*]" (Bp. Wordsworth); or, (*d*) "the same things [as I have *spoken* personally]"

Digitized by Google

2 Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision.

3 For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit,

(Theod. Mops., &c); or, (*e*) "the same things [as I have written in *former Epistles*"—not extant] (Meyer). Of these the three last miss the plain meaning of "the same," as expressing "the same things as I have written in this letter"; and (*d*) moreover forces the verb, "to *write*," into undue emphasis. Against (*e*) lies the special objection that, merely to explain this passage, it assumes the existence of letters of which there is no proof; for though Polycarp mentions "epistles" of Paul to the Philippians, the word is shewn to be frequently used in the plur. of *a single letter* (Polyc., 'Ad Philipp.,' III., on which see Cotelier; see also Bp. Lightfoot, pp. 138–40, *Lost Epistles*). And the fact that the topic of *unity* does not reappear until we reach iv. 2, is hard to reconcile with (*b*). Bp. Lightfoot (Introd., IV.), after Ewald, explains that the Apostle, being about to introduce that topic here, is interrupted in writing; resumes (at *v.* 2) with a different topic; and only finds again at iv. 2 the thread he had here dropped. But this is surely an arbitrary, even violent, hypothesis. The interpretation (*a*) adopted above is simple and natural. The objection to it, that the precept "rejoice" has no bearing on *safety*, is avoided by explaining "safe" as above.

**2.** *Beware of*] Literally, "**Look to,**" Vulg., "*videte*"—("*Beware of*" would be βλέπετε ἀπό, with gen.), implying, "be on your guard against." It is a warning against probable, not actual, danger. (Rilliet.—J.)

The warning comes in abruptly after *v.* 1 (however interpreted). The connection seems to be: "I have repeatedly invited you to *glory*, and to *rejoice*, and *in the Lord.* There are those who, not like me, would hinder this Christian joy, by substituting false ground of trust and of glorying—even *the flesh* (*v.* 3). Against such, be on your guard." Similarly, Gal. vi. 13, 14, he contrasts the Judaizers who would "glory in the flesh" of their disciples, with himself, who will not glory "save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." And accordingly the warning here is—for the first time in *this* Ep.—against such *Judaizing* teachers. See above, i. 18, 28, and notes.

Why he should introduce the topic, and so strongly enforce it, does not plainly appear. In Philippi, where there were but few Jews (see note on Acts xvi. 13), the Judaizing element cannot have been considerable. The fact that Jews were numerous and hostile in the sister city of Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 1–7) hardly accounts for his vehemence here. Probably the topic was suggested, and the vehemence prompted, rather by his own present experience of Judaizers *at Rome*, than by any special apprehension of danger *to the Philippians* from the influence of such. (See Introd., § III., B, iii.)

*Beware of dogs*] Rather, "**the dogs,**" the warning being definitely pointed against a class by the art. prefixed. The Jews called the Gentiles *dogs*, as Mohammedans call Christians to this day; but "this ignominious name, like a stone cast at the Heathen, fell upon their own heads." (Lightfoot, 'Hor. Hebr. et Talm.,' on Matt. xv. 26.—J.) See Note at end of ch.

*of evil workers*] "**The evil workers**" (art. again); not "the workers *of evil*," but such as, though they do a work, and profess to do "*the* work" (ii. 30, note), do it in a wrong spirit, on false principles, with evil results; thus "doing a work far worse than none; for they tear up the foundations that have been well laid" (Chrys.)—and (we may add) they wrongly "build again" that which in Christ has been done away (Gal. ii. 18). Cp. "crafty *workmen*" (same noun), 2 Cor. xi. 13.

*of the concision*] A contemptuous name for the *circumcision* (κατατομή for περιτομή, —cp. ἀποκόψονται, Gal. v. 12). This noun is not found in N.T., or LXX.; but in the latter its cognate verb expresses the act of inflicting on oneself wounds or "cuttings," such as were practised in heathen worship (3 [1] Kings xviii. 28). Circumcision is now (he implies) but a "cutting in the flesh" such as the Law forbids (ἐντομίδας, Lev. xxi. 5; cp. xix. 28). See Note at end of ch.

This play on words is characteristic of St. Paul. Bp. Lightfoot compares Rom. xii. 3, "to think highly, to think soberly" (ὑπερφρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν). See Winer, III. § 68, 2.

"The concision," "the circumcision," are used (abstract for concrete) for "the concised," "the circumcised."

**3.** *For we are the circumcision*] To St. Paul, though a circumcised Jew, his "circumcision is nothing"—even as he assures the Gentiles that their "uncircumcision is nothing,"—"in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6; vi. 15). Here he identifies himself with them ("*we* are"), as "the [true] circumcision," the marks of which he proceeds to state.

As (*v.* 2) the opprobrious name of "dog" recoils on the Jew from the Gentile at whom he flung it; so here the boasted title of the "circumcision," forfeited by the Jew, lapses in Christ to the Gentile.

*which worship God in the spirit*] Here

Digitized by Google

and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.

4 Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more:

5 Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, *of* the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee;

6 Concerning zeal, persecuting the

---

A. V. follows the usual reading (Θεῷ,—so Rec.). Translate (reading Θεοῦ with best authorities), "**who worship by the Spirit of God**" (πνεύματι, without art., being treated as a proper name)—*i.e.*, "with worship inspired by His Spirit"—opposed to "confidence *in the flesh*," as described in what follows. Thus, "*to worship*" (λατρεύειν) is used absolutely; as of the *Jewish* worship, Luke ii. 37; Acts xxvi. 7. By here appropriating the verb, he claims for Christians that they have not only the true circumcision, but the true *worship*.

*rejoice in Christ Jesus*] "**Glory in**"; see i. 26, and cp. 1 Cor. i. 31; 2 Cor. x. 17; also Jer. ix. 23, 24. For connection, see on *v.* 1.

*have no confidence in the flesh*] "As we repudiate trust in circumcision, so in all else that is outward." The negat. (οὐ, not μή) here used, shews that he is not merely defining the character of the true Christian, but is asserting that "we" *are* such. See Winer, III. § 55, 5.

4–6. HE CAN SURPASS THE JUDAIZERS ON THEIR OWN GROUNDS.

**4.** *Though I might also have confidence...*] Lit., "**Although myself having confidence in the flesh also.**"—"I am content to class myself with you Gentiles, though I might boast my privileges as a Jew *as well as* my calling in Christ."—"I" (emphatic), "*I* can (though *you* cannot) claim more than they, if it comes to asserting fleshly claims." With this and the next *vv.* cp. 2 Cor. xi. 18, 21, 22.

*If any other man thinketh that he hath...*] So A. V. rightly. Lit., "seems to have." The verb is here used, as elsewhere (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 40), in the sense of "seems *to himself*." He is going to state, not what he *appears to others*, but what he may justly "*think*" *himself* to be. For the moment he resumes his old Jewish standpoint, and asserts himself in such terms as, till he became a Christian, he might have used; as next *v.*

**5.** "Circumcised the *eighth* day" (therefore not an alien *proselyte*, who would be circumcised as an adult,—nor an *Ishmaelite*, at fourteen);—"of the stock of *Israel*" (therefore not a *descendant* of proselytes);—"of the tribe of *Benjamin*" (not of any of the *Ten* apostate Tribes);—"an *Hebrew* of the Hebrews"—rather "**of Hebrews**" (born of and bred by parents who had not *dropped their ancestral speech* and usages,—"*ex Hebræis*," Vulg.).

*Circumcised the eighth day*] Lit., "in circumcision, an eighth-day-man" (read περιτομῇ, *dat.*, instead of the hardly-translatable *nom.* of Rec.).

*Benjamin*] One of the tribes sprung from the beloved Rachel; the only tribe besides Levi, that (notwithstanding its original closer consanguinity with Ephraim, and the rivalry between its royal house and that of Judah) remained faithful to the sceptre of Judah, the throne of David, and the Temple Worship, when the Ten Tribes forsook them; the tribe whose glory it was that on its soil stood the Holy and royal City.

*Hebrew*] *I.e.*, in language, and customs; not as many Jews of the dispersion who had lost both, and were "uninitiated in the tongue of Israel" (Chrys.). "*Hebrew*" is opposed to "*Hellenist*" (A. V., "*Grecian*," Acts vi. 1,—see note there), both words denoting *Israelites*, the one "*Hebrew-speaking*," the other "*Greek-speaking*." See Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N. T.,' *s. v.*; where the distinction between *Hebrew*, *Jew*, and *Israelite*, is thus briefly summed up: "In the first is noted *language*; in the second, *nationality*; in the third, *religious privileges* and vocation."

Though born at Tarsus, St. Paul was, as he tells us (Acts xxii. 3), trained in Jerusalem in Hebrew learning. Accordingly, he usually cites the O.T., not as a "Hellenist" Jew would do, from LXX., but as translated by himself from the original.

*as touching the law, a Pharisee*] Cp. Acts xxiii. 6; xxvi. 5. So far he has declared what, by right of birth, he *is*: this sentence and the two following tell what, of his own free-will, he *became*. By *profession*, of the "straitest sect" of the followers of the Law; in *zeal*, active in putting down opposition to it; in *morals*, irreproachably true to it. Such he *was*: and such (no doubt) he boasted himself to be, up to the moment when that journey to Damascus (Acts ix. 1–8) was arrested by the Light and the Voice that transformed him into what he *is*.

**6.** *Concerning zeal, persecuting the church*] With what feelings he looked back on his career as a persecutor, he tells us, 1 Tim. i. 13–16. Here, he speaks of it as it was regarded by his former self,—as a proof of

Digitized by Google

church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless.

7 But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.

8 Yea doubtless, and I count all things *but* loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them *but* dung, that I may win Christ,

9 And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of

---

"zeal." Cp. Acts xxii. 3-5; xxvi. 9-11; Gal. i. 13.

*touching the righteousness which is in the law*] *I.e.*, "which lies within the letter of the Law, and consists in following that." Lit., "*in law;*" the word "*law*" (without art.) being used, here and in last *v.*, as if a proper name (so "in law," Gal. iii. 11);—not Law in general, but "*the* Law" of Moses.

*blameless*] Scil., in men's eyes; as ii. 15.

7, 8. HE NOW DESPISES SUCH, AND SEEKS BETTER GROUNDS.

**7.** *But what things were gain to me, those I counted* . . . ] More exactly, "**But such things as used to be gains to me, these I have accounted loss for Christ's sake**" (perf. tense,—"have come to account"). "These things, which belong to me as a Jew, I no longer reckon over one by one, as I used to do, as *gains*—items on the side of profit in my life-account; but, on the contrary, I have learned to sum them up under the one head of *loss*." This contrasted force of "gains," (plur.), "loss" (sing.), is thus brought out by Bp. Lightfoot.—The tense of the verb "were" (impf., *i.e.* "used to be") shews that in the foregoing summary of what, as a Jew, he was, he speaks from his *former* point of view (as in *v.* 4, where see note). *Now*, even his moral blamelessness is regarded by him as less than unavailing towards salvation,—as tending to hinder it, in so far as it may withdraw him from Christ. "For Christ's sake," therefore, he has come to view it too as "loss." Yet he is not to be understood as disparaging observance of the Moral Law; it is *loss* only (as next *v.* explains) as compared with Christ; "as to sit in candle-light is loss, when the sun has risen." (Chrys.)

**8.** *Yea doubtless, and I count all things* but *loss*] "**Nay more, I also account . . .**" He *has learned to account* (perf.) his Jewish advantages as "loss" (last *v.*),—nay farther, he *also continues to account* (pres.) "**all things to be loss**" (as well as those). "*All* things," *i.e.*, all that are apart from Christ. See Note at end of ch.

*for the excellency of the knowledge of* . . .] "I despise all, **for the sake of** the surpassing worth of the knowledge of Him."—"For the sake of,"—same prep. (διὰ with accusat.) as last *v.*, "for Christ's sake"; so below, "for Whose sake."

*my Lord*] As "*my* God," i. 3, and iv. 19, where see notes. To know Him as *mine* is (he implies) what makes the knowledge so precious above all. "*My*" is thus far more expressive than the other reading "*our*."

*for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count* . . .] "**For Whose sake I suffered loss of**" (aor.,—scil., when he turned to Christ).—"*All* things," here with art., "**my all**,"—the total of the things above recounted, and of all that he had or could have. His "all," which he then lost, his present judgment pronounces worse than worthless; he still "*accounts*" (again pres. tense, as last *v.*) all that is not of Christ as "*loss*"; yea, not merely so, but "*dung*,"—rather "refuse," "garbage," unclean and loathsome:—or perhaps, "*dogs' meat*" (σκύβαλον, as if κυσίβαλον, or ἐς κύνας βαλλόμενον),—fit but for those "*dogs*" (*v.* 2), not for "children" (ii. 15);—cp. Matt. xv. 26, 27. Chrys. explains the word to mean "husks" or "chaff," adding (again to guard against depreciation of moral obedience, as in *v.* 7) that the husk, though cast away when the fruit is ripe, is valuable in protecting its earlier growth. Cp. Ecclus. xxvii. 4 (same word).

*that I may win Christ*] "**That so I may gain . . .**" The conjn. has here its strict *final* force. The verb refers back to the "*gains*," last *v.*—His aim in rejecting those many false *gains*, is, that instead he may realize the one true and paramount *gain*—Christ. It is "to replace all his cancelled *gains*, by one single item . . . to write the word CHRIST on the side of his receipts; to enter there the brief summary of inexhaustible treasures, enough to counterbalance the *loss* of all things." (Dean Vaughan, *Lect.* XIII.)

The passage seems to be a reminiscence of that other contrast drawn by the Lord, between "*losing*" and "*gaining*" (same verbs), Matt. xvi. 26. There, the world is the "*gain*," at the cost of the "*loss*" of the soul: here, St. Paul is willing to *lose* the universe for the sake of *gaining* Christ.

9-14. HIS PRESENT AIMS, AND COURSE.

**9.** *And be found in him*] "My aim is, that I may have Christ for mine *now* (last *v.*); and that, when the Day of testing comes, I may be proved to be His, living "in Him."

Digitized by Google

the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:

10 That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings,

---

*not having mine own righteousness . . . but that which is through . . .* ] He defines, (1) negatively, (2) positively, what it is to be "*found in* Christ."

(1) *Not* shewing such righteousness as that in which he has asserted himself (*v.* 6) to be "blameless," scil., "righteousness in the Law,"—or, as here expressed, "**mine own righteousness, that which is of the Law.**" (It is *in* the Law, defined by its precepts; *of* the Law, actuated by its spirit: his *own*, being the sum total of his voluntary obedience to the Law.)

(2) *But* that righteousness which elsewhere (Rom. iii. 21, 22; &c.) he so fully sets forth, "**that which is through faith in Christ**" (omit art., and observe Χριστοῦ gen. *objecti*).—He says not "Righteousness *of* Faith," — though the verbal contrast to "Righteousness *of* Law" seems to require that expression (which elsewhere he uses, as Rom. ix. 30),—lest it should seem as if Righteousness was or could be "of *Faith*" in a sense parallel to that in which the supposed righteousness of the Jew was "of *the Law.*" Thus the prepositions of the passage are in antithesis, as well as the nouns. Righteousness is *through* (not *of*) *Faith* (not *Law*).

*which is of God*] A farther definition of the "Righteousness" spoken of. Though "*through* Faith," it is "*of* God." His therefore, not man's; the words "*of God*" being opposed to "*mine own*," as well as to "*of Law.*"

Thus we have, in theological language, God's Grace as the moving Cause, Christ's Work as the meritorious Cause, and Faith as the instrument, in Justification. It comes "through Faith," to him whose faith is "in Christ," "of God."

*by faith*] Lit., "*on the* faith" (art.). These words farther describe Righteousness as bestowed "*on the ground of such* faith" (as above defined),—scil., "in Christ."—"On," represents Faith as its *basis*; "through," as its *instrument*. For both, cp. Acts iii. 16.

To sum up:—The Righteousness spoken of is a present reality which the Christian is to "*have*" (not merely as imputed to him); it is his, so far as he has "faith *in Christ*"; it thus comes "*through faith*" as its channel; but is "*of God*" as its Origin; and is the fulfilment He sets "*upon that faith.*" Thus the great doctrine of Righteousness by Faith, incidentally introduced to point his reprobation of the Judaizers' self trust, is briefly yet fully given in these few pregnant words.

10. *That I may know him*] Lit., "[*For the purpose*] *of knowing Him.*" (For construction cp. Rom. vi. 6; and see Winer, III. § 44, 4, (*b*).)—These words belong in construction (not, as Chrys., to "by faith," but) to the preceding "that I may gain Christ and be found in Him;"—while in thought they revert to the "knowledge of Christ" in *v.* 8. If he may attain *that* knowledge he is ready to lose all, "that he may gain Christ . . ., so as to know Him;"—*to know, i.e.*, as a Person, which implies access to Him, inward sense of His indwelling, communion with Him.—Cp. John xvii. 3.

*and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings*] "Knowing Him" is here shewn in two aspects,—(1) in His Exaltation, (2) in His Humiliation. It is experience (1) of the quickening virtue of His Resurrection, (2) of assimilation to Him by partaking of His Sufferings (Wiesinger).

*the power of his resurrection*] Scil., the Power (δύναμιν,—cp. δύνασθαι, *v.* 21), whereby He raised Himself from the dead, thus "declared to be the Son of God with *power*" (Rom. i. 4),—and will raise all that are His, first from sin and finally from Death;—the Power, namely, of His Spirit (Rom. viii. 9–11). To the Christian, conscious experience of the present victory in him of the Spirit over *sin*, is the earnest of the ultimate triumph for him of that Spirit over *Death.*

*and the fellowship of his sufferings*] Omit art., with best MSS., and see Winer as cited on i. 7. The words, "the *power* and *fellowship*," thus joined under one art., express the *knowledge* of Christ under its twofold aspect, as above,—*inward* and *outward.* This "fellowship" consists not merely in the fact of suffering as He did, but in a spirit drawn near to Him by sufferings borne in His strength. See this beautifully drawn out in the Exhortation in our 'Visitation of the Sick.'

*being made conformable*] "**In being conformed**" (pres.), *i.e.*, by a progressive working. The verb is derived from "*form*" (ii. 6, where see note). Cp. "*conformed*," *v.* 21, and note,—also Addl. Note.

These words relate to both the aspects (shewn above) of "knowing" Christ. He regards "*Death*" as being to him the consummation of "*sufferings*," and the necessary antecedent of the "*Resurrection.*" Gradually, through sufferings and death, he is "being conformed" into the likeness of Christ's Death;—in the Resurrection (next *v.*) the conformity is to be complete (*v.* 21). Cp. for

Digitized by Google

being made conformable unto his death;

11 If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.

12 Not as though I had already

---

the train of thought, Rom. vi. 2-11; 2 Cor. iv. 10.

11. *If by any means I might attain unto*] "**May attain**" (aor. conj., as "may apprehend," next *v.*). "If by any means" expresses not doubt, but rather the eagerness that strives by *all* ways to reach its end. —"Attain unto," implies a *goal* in view (expressed below, *v.* 14); the verb (with its usual *local* meaning, "to reach one's destination") serving to introduce the idea of the *race* (next *v.*; cp. ii. 16). See 1 Clem. R., LXIII., cited above, Introd., § V., A, ii., note 5, where the same verb has "*goal*" as its object.—"The Resurrection from the dead" accordingly is the *goal*; the *prize* is with Him Whom it is the Apostle's single aim to gain,—Christ.

From these two *vv.* we learn how to him (i. 21), "*life is Christ*,"—because in life he is being conformed, outwardly by suffering with Him, inwardly by His quickening Power, into Christ's Likeness: "*death is gain*,"—as the passage to the Resurrection-Life, in which he shall be Christ's and Christ his.

*the resurrection of the dead*] Translate, "**the resurrection from the dead**," according to the true reading. The reading of A.V. (also of Rec.) has little evidence, and yields a defective sense;—for in "the resurrection *of* the dead"—the General Resurrection, all *must* have part. "The resurrection *from* the dead" means (cp. Luke xx. 35) "the Resurrection *of the just*" (Luke xiv. 14). Here the meaning is farther pointed by the reappearance of the prep. (ἐκ) in the word for "resurrection" (ἐξανάστασις—nowhere else in N.T.). So Hooker explains it, 'E. P,' V. lxviii. 12.

12. *Not as though I had already attained*] "**Not that I had already obtained**," scil., the *prize*, expressed below (*v.* 14), of the race, implied in last *v.* So, "one *receiveth* the *prize*" (same verb and noun, 1 Cor. ix. 24). The words guard against the supposition that, on the moment of his conversion, when he was "laid hold on by Christ" (see below), he secured that which in truth he but hopes to win at the end of a lifelong struggle. The tense of the verb (aor.) relates to that moment (as "I suffered loss," *v.* 8,—cp. next note). A.V. here misleads, by employing the same word "*attain*" to render the different verbs in this and last *v.*,—thus suggesting "*the resurrection*" as the object of *this* verb; which would be unmeaning, for his readers needed not to be told that he "had not already attained *the resurrection*."—To "*attain*" the *goal*, to "*obtain*" the prize,—neither is yet to him a realized fact, but for both he is hoping and striving.

*either were already perfect*] "**Or am already made perfect**," lit., "*have been perfected*" (perf. tense). Observe the change of tense in these *vv.*—"At my conversion I *did* not win the prize; to this day I *have* not achieved perfection." (Cp. Hebr. xi. 40.) By a sustained struggle, not at one stroke, comes the victory. The Power (*v.* 10) is working in him, but its work is not yet fully wrought.

*but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which. . .*] The general sense is plain;—"Think not that I would have you regard me as having *then* secured the prize of the Christian course. What I affirm is, that, *ever since then*, I am on that course, striving for that prize."

But as to the details there is much question. The A.V. rendering, (*a*) "*that* for which" (ἐφ' ᾧ), supplies to the relat. an anteced. which becomes the object of the verb "apprehend." This yields a satisfactory meaning, "I press on to lay hold on *that*, for which (that I might lay hold on it) Christ laid hold on me" (scil., at his conversion). So the anteced. has to be supplied, Luke v. 25; and so the prep. (ἐπὶ) is used, Gal. v. 13; Eph. ii. 10, &c.

A like sense follows from rendering, (*b*) "*to which end*" (taking ἐφ' ᾧ adverbially).

If either (*a*) or (*b*) be adopted, the sentence expresses the *Divine purpose* in calling him.—"I persevere if I may *lay hold of* the prize; *for which purpose* (that I might persevere) *hold has been taken of me* by Jesus Christ." (Bp. Horsley, 'Sermons,' XXVII.—J.)

Others however (also taking ἐφ' ᾧ adverbially) translate them, (*c*) "*because*," "*inasmuch as*." So Rom. v. 12,—"*for that*" (A. V.,—see note there; also 2 Cor. v. 4).—With this rendering, the words state the *reason why he feels bound* to follow,—"the matter being one of *debt*" (Chrys.). And this is to be preferred; for (*a*) and (*b*) seem unduly to narrow the purpose for which he was called into a merely personal one (Meyer). Translate accordingly, "**But I press on, if I may also lay hold, forasmuch as I was also laid hold on by Christ.**" The "also," "also," are correlative to each other;—"that I may *so* lay hold, *as* I was laid hold on."—Both the verbs (διώκω, καταλάβω) are used absolutely, as the former is in *v.* 14, the latter in *v.* 13.

He says not, "*I run*" (as 1 Cor. ix. 26),



Digitized by Google

attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.

13 Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but *this* one thing *I do*, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before,

14 I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

15 Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.

16 Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the

---

but "*I press on;*"—the latter verb conveying the strain of strenuous undivided effort in the pursuit. (Chrys.)

His conversion marks the date, not of *his* "obtaining," but of Christ's "laying hold on" him and setting him on the course in which he seeks finally to "lay hold on" Christ.

13. *Brethren*] From his direct address to them in the opening of this ch., he has been carried on into the thought of his own course,—its struggles, its hopes, and its end. Now, resuming from *v.* 1 the word "brethren," he bespeaks their attention to the lessons contained in that course.

*I count not myself . . .*] Both prons. are emphatic:—"*Others* may regard me as secure;—or may blind themselves in false security. *I* know *my* state as it truly is,—one of expectant striving."—(For "not," A and א give "not *yet.*")—"Count," better "**reckon**" (λογίζομαι,—not ἡγοῦμαι, as *vv.* 7, 8).

*but* this *one thing* I do] "**I mind**" (cp. "*be minded,*" *v.* 15, where see note).

*forgetting those things which are behind*] Not his Jewish privileges and attainments (*those* are not forgotten, but remembered to be renounced); but rather, the completed portion of his Christian course. He suffers himself not to think of that, but only of the "things which are before," scil., the portion of that course which is still in the future.

*reaching forth*] A graphic word (ἐπεκτεινόμενος), descriptive of the attitude of the runner,—the body thrown forward, the hand outstretched, in eager straining for the prize.

14. *I press toward the mark for the prize*] The former prep. and noun give the *direction* of his pursuit, the "**goal**;"—the latter its *object*, the "*prize.*" See note on *v.* 11.

*of the high calling . . .*] Not the special miraculous call of the Apostle; but the "heavenward calling" (ἄνω κλῆσις), whereby every Christian is called to enter on the race for the prize. The *prize* is thus "the prize of the calling," as being its end. The *calling* is "of God in Christ Jesus," as addressed by God to men in the Mission of His Son. "He will have thee run the race below; He gives the crown above. Even on earth the most honoured among athletes are crowned not on the racecourse below; but the King *calls them up* (ἄνω καλέσας) to his presence and crowns them there." (Chrys.)

15, 16. He invites them to persevere in the like Course.

15. *Let us therefore*] Here, in the *plural* pron., he directly applies to them the teaching of his own course, including them with himself in this exhortation.

*perfect*] Not of course in the absolute sense,—nor "*perfected*" (as *v.* 12),—nor as Matt. v. 48 (where see note); but "*full-aged,*" opposed to "children" ("*men,*"—A.V., 1 Cor. xiv. 20), to "babes" (Eph. iv. 13, 14; Hebr. v. 13, 14);—such as have done with the rudimentary righteousness of the Law, which belongs to "babes" (Gal. iv. 3). See Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N. T.', *s. v.*—"The *perfect* and the *perfected* are different; the former is equipped for the race, the latter is close on the prize" (Bengel).

See Jer. Taylor, 'Unum Necess.,' I. 2, on the various meanings of Christian *perfection.* "Evangelical perfection supposes a beginning, infant grace, progression, watch fulness, trembling fear."—See also Horsley, 'Sermons,' XXVIII.—J.

*Let us . . . be thus minded*] Lit., "**Let us mind this,**"—scil., the "one thing" of *v.* 13:—"Let us persevere, without dwelling on the past, in the course that lies before us." In "*this,*" accordingly, is included all that he has told us above of the spirit of his life (*vv.* 7–14),—his disclaimer of "righteousness of his own," his seeking "to have the righteousness of God,—through faith in Christ," "to gain Christ," "to know Christ," "to attain" the goal, "to obtain" the prize.

*and if in anything ye be otherwise minded*] "If in any point (not included in the 'one thing' needful for all to 'mind') ye be otherwise (*i.e.*, *wrongly*) minded, in such point *also* God will shew you the right way" (as He has already done in that *one thing*).—He speaks of errors in the conduct of the

Digitized by Google

same rule, let us mind the same thing.

17 Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample.

18 (For many walk, of whom

Christian life, springing from wrong views whether of duty or of doctrine,—alike in either case to be corrected by God's revelation of the truth. "God shall reveal even this," rather "**this too**,"—*this* as to which you are in error, as well as *that* to the knowledge of which all who are "*perfect*" have attained.—The limited sense in which *perfect* is used in this *v.* (see above), is well illustrated by these words, in which possible error is attributed to some of the "perfect."

Bengel however explains, "otherwise [than the perfect are minded]"; arguing from the change of person from "*us*" to "*ye*." But the pronouns are not expressed in the Greek, as this would require.

This *v.* bears on the lessons of humility and charity which pervade the Ep. It teaches us to distinguish the non-essentials from the essentials of the Christian life; to attribute the latter to all who are Christians indeed; but, as to the former, to recognize that all are apt to err, all must look to God for correction.

**16.** *Nevertheless*] A limitation of the promise in the close of last *v.* "We who have entered on the race, may trust God to set us right if we err in aught, *provided only* we are persevering in the course." The assurance of light from Him does not supersede the duty of perpetual and watchful effort.

*whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same*] Omit all the words that follow "by the same," from "rule" to end of *v.* (inclusive),—a certainly spurious addition. Translate, "**what we have arrived at, [it is needful] to walk according to the same.**" The former verb (φθάνειν) properly means "to come first:" in later Greek it passes into the meaning of "to arrive" simply (which is its regular meaning in modern Greek). Here, it expresses the act of *reaching* a point in the course. Each at any given moment has his own point of attainment; but all the points lie on the line of that one course; and by that line each is to walk, to the end. "To walk" (στοιχεῖν), *i. e.*, to walk *in a line* (στοῖχος), to "walk *by rule*" (Gal. vi. 16), to "walk *orderly*" (Acts xxi. 24, A.V.).—Some limit the *attainment* spoken of, to knowledge; others to things moral and spiritual. But the *knowledge* proper to the Christian includes all, for it is to know *Christ* (*vv.* 8, 10).

17–19. Such Example to be followed: Warning against Counter-Examples.

**17.** *be followers together of me*] Lit., "*joint-imitators*";—well rendered by Old Lat., "*coimitatores*."—His example, as above set forth, will be a farther bond of unity among them.—The limit within which he offers himself as an example, is expressed, 1 Cor. xi. 1.

*mark them which* . . .] "**Observe** (that you may *imitate*) them." The same verb is used of observing in order to *avoid*, Rom. xvi. 17.—"Follow, in my absence, such among yourselves (*e.g.* those commended, iv. 3) as most closely follow me and mine."

Dropping the metaphor of the *course*, and with it the verbs "to *press on*," to "*walk by rule*," he introduces a new verb (περιπατεῖν), to "take one's way," to "pursue one's daily walk," good or bad,—expressing by it (here) his own walk which they are to follow, and (next *v.*) that of those whom they are to shun.

*ye have us for an ensample* . . .] In the plur. pron. he associates with his own example that of others; those, probably, who had been with him at Philippi,—Timothy, Silas, Luke. He does not assume to himself to be their sole pattern.

**18.** *(For many walk, of whom* . . .] *I.e.*, "It is needful to offer you our example, *for* contrary examples are before you."

The construction would regularly be, "many walk, as I have told you, as enemies of," &c. But it is broken by the vehement grief that bursts from the Apostle at the thought of Christian truth perverted and Christian liberty abused.

*I have told you*] "**Used to tell**" (impf.) scil., in his personal teaching.

*and now tell you even weeping*] Tears were drawn from the Apostle by the knowledge of moral defilement in one Church (2 Cor. ii. 4); and by the prospect of false guides misleading another (Acts xx. 31). Here, both causes concur; and with twofold bitterness he weeps to think that there are those who would shew the Philippians the example of perverting that Christian liberty which he preached, into licence for sensual excess.—The words imply that such evil influences are increasing in the Church.

*the enemies of the cross of Christ*] Those, namely, who make His Atonement a plea for continuing in sin, refusing to "*take up the cross*" (Matth. xvi. 24), to be "*crucified with Christ*," to "*crucify the flesh*" (Gal. ii. 20; v. 24), to be "*partakers of His sufferings*," and "*conformed unto His Death*" (above, *v.* 10).—They are not the same as the Judaizing



Digitized by Google

I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, *that they are* the enemies of the cross of Christ:

19 Whose end *is* destruction, whose God *is their* belly, and *whose* glory *is* in their shame, who mind earthly things.)

20 For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ:

21 Who shall change our vile body,

---

teachers of *v.* 2; but rather, nominal Christians living in, and (by example rather than precept) inculcating, such heathen licence as he warns the Romans against (Rom. vi. 1, 15), such as seems to have existed among the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 1-11). The history of modern missions painfully testifies to the fact that the moral pollutions of heathenism too often survive among those who have not only outwardly but to all appearance intellectually embraced the Gospel.

**19.** Observe the points of the contrast between this *v.* and 14. For the goal of "the Resurrection," they have "perdition" as their end; for the glorious "prize," their "glory is in their shame"; for the "heavenward calling," they "mind earthly things;" for "God in Christ Jesus," their "God is their belly."

*destruction*] This rendering (as well as Vulg., "*interitus*") falls utterly short of the force of the original word, which here (as i. 28) can mean nothing short of final "**perdition.**"

*whose God* is their *belly*,] *I.e.*, such as (Rom. xvi. 18) "serve not our Lord, but their own *belly*";—such as say (1 Cor. xv. 32), "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."

whose *glory* is *in their shame*] These men in their delusion boast of as *glory* that which is in truth their *shame*;—scil., their licence and the sensual indulgence it permits; like those of whom we read, 2 Pet. ii. 10-19.

*who mind earthly things*] Lit., "**And their glory [is] in their shame, they who mind earthly things.**" This irregularity of construction, so expressive of indignant emotion, disappears in A. V.

See Col. iii. 2, for the same contrast between the "earthly" object, and the "things above" (the verb being same as here, φρονεῖν).

20, 21. The Heavenly City and Heavenly Hope.

**20.** The contrast of last *v.* is here reversed. For *their* "earthly things," *their* "belly-god," *their* "glory in shame," *their* final "perdition;" *we* (emphatic) have Heaven,—Christ the Lord,—the glorified body of the Resurrection,—the Saviour's Power working to subdue and to renew.

*For our conversation* . . . .] "Our" is usually referred to "*us*" of *v.* 17 (*i.e.*, "me and mine"), *vv.* 18, 19 being parenthetical. Thus the connection will be, "Follow *us* (not those earthly-minded guides), for our example savours of heaven." But it seems better to understand "our" as relating to the "*perfect*," the "*us*" of *vv.* 15, 16, and to complete the connection thus:—"Let us hold to our course, you following me, though many follow earthly and sensual ways,—for we Christians belong to Heaven" (cp. *v.* 14).

*conversation*] In this word (πολίτευμα) the image of citizenship reappears from i. 27 (πολιτεύεσθε, A.V., "*let your conversation be*"). There, the idea is of the duty of united *defence* of a common city; here, it is wider, including *all the Christian life* on earth, with its relation to the heavenly Hereafter. The rendering (*a*) of A. V., following Vulg., &c., "*conversation*," mode of life [as citizens], gives a suitable sense; but no instance has been adduced of this meaning for the *noun*, which is only inferred from the admitted use of the *verb* in a corresponding meaning. Others render (*b*) "*citizenship*" ("*municipatus*,"—Tertullian, 'Adv. Marcion.,' III. 24; V., 20; also Jerome, on Zech. iii. 7); but for this also examples are wanting. It is best therefore to translate (*c*) "commonwealth," "**city**,"—as 2 Macc. xii. 7. This concrete meaning, though not presenting an exact contrast to the abstract and subjective "minding earthly things," on the other hand corresponds better than (*a*) or (*b*) with the verb "**subsists**" (ὑπάρχει, not "*is*" merely), which points to a real and objective existence.—"Our present and true country is Heaven,—our *Jerusalem which is above*" (Gal. iv. 26; cp. Hebr. xi. 10, 16; xiii. 14). See Note at end of ch.

*from whence also we* . . . .] As our home is there, so our hope is thence.—The expectation rests on the promise, Acts i. 11.

*we look for*] "**Eagerly wait for**;" cp. Rom. viii. 23, 25.

*the Saviour*, *the Lord Jesus Christ*] "**Wait for the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour**:"—as coming to give in the end not "perdition" (*v.* 19) but *salvation*.

**21.** *Who shall change* . . . *that it may be fashioned like unto* . . . ] More accurately, "**shall change the fashion of** . . .,

Digitized by Google

that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

---

[that it may become] **conformable unto . . .**" (μετασχηματίσει, σύμμορφον). The thought of his Lord in Heaven causes him to revert to the thoughts, even the words ("*fashion*," "*form*"), of the passage (ii. 6-11) in which he had traced His Course through abasement to the Throne. There, He puts off His *Glory*, taking the *form* of man with its servile *fashion*, and its consequent *humiliation* in Death. Here, the progression is reversed:—and by a gradual *conforming* (*v.* 10), which through the *change of fashion* of the raised body is to issue in entire and final *conformity*, the Christian passes with Christ from the *humiliation* of this mortal state into the *glory* of the Resurrection-Life. See Note at end of ch., on "*shall change*."

*our vile body . . . . his glorious body*] "**The body of our humiliation.**" The "vile body" of A. V. is an unhappy rendering, conveying a contempt for the corporeal state which is alien from the Apostle's teaching here and elsewhere. The words rather convey that "humiliation" was not the state for which the body was created, but one that has supervened. Similarly, "**the body of His Glory,**"—that in which His Glory dwells, and whence it shines forth. See Note at end of ch. on "*vile body*."

*that it may be . . . .*] "**That it may become.**" The words so translated are not found in the best MSS. They, however, supply the sense correctly.

*according to the working whereby he is able*] Lit., "the working of His being able," that is "**of His Power**";—the Power, namely, of His Resurrection (*v.* 10).

*even to subdue all things*] "**Also to subdue all things**;" not merely to transfigure man's body from "dishonour" into "glory" (1 Cor. xv. 43); but *moreover* to put down all opposing power (cp. 1 Cor. xv. 24-26; Eph. i. 22; also Hebr. ii. 8).

With this sublime thought he closes and enforces his warning;—"Follow not those whose walk is of the earth; but be of us whose walk is heavenward; for we are safe in the strong City of that Power Which prevails over all enemies,—over sin, and death, and hell."

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on CHAP. III.

**2.** *Beware of dogs . . .*] See Theodt. on Ps. lviii. [lix.];—in which Messianic Psalm it is remarkable that the persecuting Jews are compared to *dogs* (*vv.* 7 [6] and 15 [14]); and farther that they are described (*v.* 3 [2]) as οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (cp. κακοὺς ἐργάτας). "Dog," as a term of reproach, is used in classical writers to express *shameless* (*e.g.*, Hom., 'Il.,' VI. 356). In Eastern countries, where dogs are scavengers, it conveys *unclean*. In O. T. it is applied to *persecutors* (as above,—see also Ps. xxi. [xxii.] 21 [20]); to *false teachers*, Isai. lvi. 10, 11. In N. T. see Matt. vii. 6; xv. 21, 27; Rev. xxii. 15 (cp. Deut. xxiii. 18). (See Gataker, 'Advers. Misc. Posth.,' XXXVIII.—J.)

*the concision*] Another interpretation, "the *rending* [*of the Church*]," "*schism*," is to be mentioned only because adopted by Theodt. and noticed by Chrys. (who, however, prefers the ordinary rendering). Donne adopts this interpretation, 'Sermons,' CXX.—See Suicer, *s. v.*; Gataker, *ut supr.*—J.

**8.** *Yea doubtless, and . . .*] The reading ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν is better supported than μενοῦνγε of Rec. It means "nay indeed, then;"—οὖν continuing the previous statement, which μὲν confirms, while ἀλλὰ corrects it by contrasting and extending;—introducing for ἥγημαι (perf.), ἡγοῦμαι (pres.); and for ταῦτα, πάντα.—See Winer, 'Gr.,' III. § 53, 7, *a*. The καὶ before ἡγοῦμαι likewise points the change of tense, but is doubtful (not in Cod. B).

**20.** *our conversation*] This meaning (*a*) appears to be erroneously attributed to the word πολίτευμα in the only passage that has been adduced in support of it. Ὁ δέ γε περὶ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς πολιτεύματος διηγηματικὸς ἡμῖν λόγος (Euseb., 'H. E.,' V. (*Proœm.*). Here it rather means "*commonwealth*."

The passages of Aristot., 'Pol.' (III., iv., v.) which are alleged in favour of (*b*), do not prove the point required. For though Aristotle says the word is = πολιτεία (πολιτεία καὶ πολίτευμα σημαίνει ταυτόν—v.), he means πολιτεία in the sense of *mode of government*, *constitution* (τάξις τῶν ἀρχῶν—iv.),—not of *citizenship* or *municipatus*.

The classical use of the word appears to be,—(1) *an act done by one as a citizen*, *an act of policy*, or *of government* (as Demosth., 'Cherson.,' 71); (2) *a form of government* (as Aristot., above). Hence follows readily, (3) the meaning above preferred, *a "state"* or "*commonwealth*;"—which is found in a

Digitized by Google

Macc. (as above), in Philo, in Polybius, &c. (See Meyer *in loc.*)

Ἡ ἐκκλησία . . . πόλις ἐπὶ γῆς . . . Εἰκόνας τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ κτίζουσι γράφοντες· αἱ γὰρ Ὑπερβόριοι καὶ Ἀρίμασποι πόλεις, καὶ τὰ Ἠλύσια πέδια, δικαίων πολιτεύματα. (Clem. Alex., 'Strom.,' VI. 26—J.)

Cp. Philo, 'De Confus. Lingg.' Αἱ γὰρ τούτων ψυχαὶ . . πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χῶρον ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται . . . νομίζουσαι . . . (Cited by Loesner, *in loc.*—J.)

21. *Who shall change . . . fashioned like unto . . .* ] A.V. here follows Vulg., "*reformabit, configuratum.*" Old Lat. better,—"*transfigurabit, conformatum.*"

The words μετασχηματίσει, σύμμορφον, are here used with accurate discrimination. Σχῆμα being = outward "*fashion*," while μορφή = "*form*," implying inward reality—and their derivatives inheriting these meanings,—it follows that the Apostle here declares a future *change of outward fashion* of body, to result in a full *assimilation of form* (implying the whole *nature*) of the risen Christian to his glorified Lord. He has told us (*v.* 10) of the gradual process by which the Christian is, in this life, "*in course of conforming*" (συμμορφιζόμενος) to Christ's Death. That process, we here learn, is to be consummated by the "*change of fashion*" of the body, from the natural to the spiritual (1 Cor. xv. 44), in the Resurrection. Then the entire man, body and soul, shall be "*conformable*" (σύμμορφος),—assimilated alike in outward aspect and in inward verity, to the Glory of the Lord. The Power that works is the same throughout—ἡ δύναμις of *v.* 10 is τὸ δύνασθαι here;—only the putting forth of its highest "working" is reserved for the Day of the final change. (See notes on "*conformable*," *v.* 10; and on "*form*," "*fashion*," ii. 6, 8.)

*vile body . . . glorious body*] The Vulg. ("*corpus humiliationis, corpori claritatis*") following Old Lat. and followed by the Rhemisl ("*body of our lowness, body of His glory*") has here preserved the rough Hebraic strength of the original. It is unfortunate that all English Versions since Wiclif have preferred to smooth it down at the sacrifice of force and fulness of meaning. So, Beza gives "*corpus humile, corpori glorioso*"; Luther, "*nichtigen Leib, verklärten Leibe*"; Diodati, "*corpo vile, corpo glorioso*"; Ostervald, &c., "*corps vil, corps glorieux*,"—also De Sacy.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *From particular admonitions* 4 *he proceedeth to general exhortations,* 10 *shewing how he rejoiced at their liberality towards him lying in prison, not so much for the supply of his own wants, as for the grace of God in them.* 19 *And so he concludeth with prayer and salutations.*

THEREFORE, my brethren dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, *my* dearly beloved.

2 I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord.

---

CHAP. IV. 1. THE DUTY OF STEDFASTNESS.

The Apostle here resumes the thread of his Epistle. In the close of the digression of ch. iii., he has pointed to the hope of the Resurrection (iii. 20, 21); and from that high theme he now passes, with "therefore" as at the conclusion of his great Resurrection chapter (1 Cor. xv. 58), to the duty of *stedfastness.* Here, as there, the rapture of anticipation of the glory that shall be, serves but to strengthen his grasp on the earthly present of the Christian life.

1. *my brethren . . .* ] He multiplies expressions of endearment. Partly (perhaps) to soften the coming words of admonition,—partly because of the thought of their kindness which he has still to thank them for,—he overflows with loving words. From the denunciation of heresy (iii. 2) and corruption (*ib.* 18, 19), he turns in love and joy to these faithful and blameless "*brethren.*"

*dearly beloved beloved* With this word he begins and ends his loving exhortation, dwelling on it with tender pleasure.

*longed for*] This word conveys his desire to see them again, as the cognate verb in i. 8. —See Introd., § V., A, ii., note 5.

*my joy and crown*] To one other Church alone,—the sister Macedonian Church, does he address like terms of exalted praise; see 1 Thess. ii. 19. Corn. a Lap. aptly compares Prov. xvii. 6, "Children's children are the *crown* of old men."

The "joy" is in the *present* (i. 4; ii. 2);—the "crown" pertains rather to his *future* "glorying in them in the day of Christ" (ii. 16). So Pelag., "Per vos in praesenti laetificor et in futuro coronabor."

The "crown" (στέφανος) is that of the *victor* (cp. "I have *run*" in ii. 16 above cited), not the *royal* crown, which he never arrogates to himself. Usually (see Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N. T.,' *s. v.*) this word in N. T. denotes the *coronal* of *victory* or *festivity*; distinguished from the *kingly diadem*

Digitized by Google

3 And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and *with* other my fellowlabourers, whose names *are* in the book of life.

---

(διάδημα).—But apparently the "crowns" (στέφανοι) of the Elders (Rev. iv. 4), and assuredly that of the Son of Man (*ib.*, xiv. 14), are of *royalty*. The LXX. use the same word for the *king's* [?] crown (עטרה) 2 Kin. [2 Sam.] xii. 30; Esth. viii. 15; Ps. xx. [xxi.] 4 [3].—The correct statement seems to be, that the former noun means a circlet of any sort, while the latter is restricted to the official crown symbolizing sovereignty.

*so stand fast in the Lord*] "*So*," *i. e.*, as becomes citizens of such a city; cp. iii. 20. Cp. also i. 27 (where see note), in which *v.*, as here, *stedfastness* is urged as a duty resulting from the fact of *citizenship*. There it is, "Stand fast, undismayed by your adversaries"; here, "Stand fast, sustained by the assurance of glory,—finding *in the Lord* strength so to stand." (1 Thess. iii. 8.)

2, 3. Admonition in a Case of Discord.

2. *I beseech Euodias* . . . ] This name is wrongly given thus in A. V. with masc. termination. The fem. pron. "these" [women] in next *v.* (where see note) proves it to be the name of a woman, "**Euodia.**" She and Syntyche appear to have stood high in the Church, whether because of their services (next *v.*), or their social rank (cp. Acts xvii. 4, 12), or (possibly) their calling as Deaconesses. Misunderstanding between such is an injury to the Body; and he therefore thus publicly urges them to be reconciled. The repetition of the verb, "I *beseech* Euodia, I *beseech* Syntyche," while pointing the words as a personal appeal to each, divides the expression of regard, and of blame, equally between both.

For the large part played by women in the first days of the gospel at Philippi, see Acts xvi. 13; 14, 15; 16–18; 40. These two may have been among the "women," "by the river side,"—the first audience to whom the Apostle preached Christ in Europe (Acts xvi. 13). See Introd., § II., B, 1; § IV., C.—Also § V., A, i. 4, note 3.

*that they be of the same mind in the Lord*] Not merely to be reconciled, but *in a Christian spirit*,—in Him according to Whose "mind" all His servants are to "be minded" (ii. 5).

3. *And I intreat*] Read "**Yea, I ask**" (ναί, for καὶ of Rec., with best authorities). The verb (ἐρωτῶ) means "*I request*" (as *of an equal*); to which sense it is extended in N. T. Greek; its classical meaning being "*I inquire*." (Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N. T.', *s. v.*)

*true yokefellow*] The position of the person here addressed cannot have been less than that of Chief Pastor of the Church of Philippi. (So Luther, &c.,—and some recent commentators.) For (1) he is distinguished by this term "*yokefellow*" (expressing a certain parity with the Apostle himself), as superior to the ordinary "*fellowlabourers*" mentioned after. (2) In so addressing him the Apostle, without fear of mistake, can omit to name him. (3) The duty of reconciling two important persons is here laid on him primarily, as a man in authority. These words therefore go far to prove the existence in this Church of a Chief *Bishop*, distinguished in office though not by title from the "*bishops*" (presbyters) of i. 1 (where see note), among whom we may regard him as included in that *v.* But farther, if we adopt the opinion (Grotius, Hammond, &c., and recently Bp. Lightfoot), which seems in itself highly probable, that Epaphroditus, though the bearer of the letter, is the person here addressed and charged with the task of reconciliation, then we must conclude (with Theodt.—see on ii. 25—though on different grounds), that Epaphroditus was the Presiding Bishop of Philippi: and we find a complete explanation of the absence of all notice of such Bishop from the opening of the Ep., in the fact that he was with St. Paul when he wrote it.—That he, though present, is here addressed as if among the Philippians, belongs to the epistolary usage (see first note on ii. 25), by which the writer mentally projects himself into the time present to his readers.

The supposition (mentioned by Chrys. and supported by many) that in the latter of these words (γνήσιε σύζυγε) we have a proper name "*Syzygus*" (or even, as others conjecture, in the former, "*Gnesius*"), may be set aside as improbable. See Note at end of ch., on "*yokefellow*."

"True", *i. e.*, "**genuine**"; "thou who art in deed, by nature as well as by office, a *partner* with me *in the yoke* of Christ's service."

*help those women which laboured with me*] A. V. here misses the application of the first pronoun, and the force of the relative. Translate, "**help these** (scil., Euodia and Syntyche) **seeing that they strove together with me.**" The verb is the same as that used i. 27, of the *unanimous struggle* of the Church for the faith. There, and probably

Digitized by Google

4 Rejoice in the Lord alway: *and* again I say, Rejoice.

5 Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord *is* at hand.

---

here, participation in the Apostle's conflict against *persecution* is conveyed. It may be, as Bengel suggests, that these women had suffered with him when he was scourged and imprisoned at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19–24). The tense (aor.) of the verb suits this view.

Thus the purport is, "I exhort these women to Christian concord: and farther, I call on thee—whose it is, by nature as well as by office, to cooperate with me—to assist them in regaining the oneness of mind which ought to subsist between women who once were as one in working and suffering with me."

He forbears to rebuke their dissension as a fault: but treats it tenderly as an infirmity or difficulty,—requiring "*help*," towards the concord which (he assumes) they are themselves striving to regain.

*in the Gospel*] In spreading the Gospel,—not, of course, by preaching (this he forbids, 1 Cor. xiv. 34), but by doing and suffering with and for its preachers. In this work he owns them as partakers with him. Thus early is recognized woman's place in the Church's service.

*with Clement* . . . ] Here he apparently associates Clement and the others with his "yokefellow" in the proposed task of peace-making. Thus these words are to be connected with "help," and not, as by most with "laboured with me." To mention the past services of Clement and others would be here irrelevant: but it is in keeping with the spirit and tenour of the Ep., that not the Chief Pastor only, but all who under him are "fellowlabourers" with the Apostle, should be invited by him to unite in restoring harmony in the Church. The importance thus stamped on the matter serves to shew these women at once his high regard for them, and his sense of the hurt done to the cause of Christ by their discord.

Of Clement, this passage only tells us that he was, when it was written, a leading man in the Philippian Church. But his origin may have been (like his name) Roman; and there is no reason to doubt that he afterwards removed to Rome and was, as Origen states ('In Joh.' I., 29) the Clement, Bishop of Rome, who wrote the Epistle [? Epistles] that bears his name. See Note at end of ch., on "*Clement*":—also Introd., § V., A, i. 4.

*whose names* are *in* . . . ] "No need that I should write their names here, to be read of men: God has them written in His Book." See Note at end of ch., on "*the book*."

*book of life*] This expression is from the O.T. (Exod. xxxii. 32; Ps. lxviii. [lxix.] 29 [28]). As in an earthly, so in the Heavenly City, the names of its citizens are entered in a Book, from whence those that prove unworthy are to be expunged. St. Paul nowhere else mentions this Book: but see Luke x. 20; Rev. xiii. 8, &c.; also Rev. iii. 5, where the "*blotting out*" from the Book is spoken of, proving that to be written in it does not convey final security. See Whitby's citations (*in loc.*) from the Targum and from the Fathers.—J.

4–9. Exhortations to Christian Temper, Thought, and Conduct.

**4.** The connection of this and what follows, with the foregoing *vv.*, though not expressed in words, is traceable. Instead of entering into the dispute between these women, he points to the things which form the temper of the Christian citizenship:—*joy* in Christ,—*forbearance* like His,—the *looking for* His Coming,—*prayer* which lays all on God,—*thankfulness* to God,—the *peace* of God.

*Rejoice in the Lord*] Repeated from iii. 1, where see note. The characteristic note of joy here breaks out afresh.

*alway*] For "he that rejoices *in God* alway rejoices." (Chrys.)—"How then says the Lord, *Blessed are they that mourn* (Matt. v. 4)?—Because so to mourn is to rejoice. For he says not barely *Rejoice*, but, *in the Lord*. He that is *in the Lord* rejoices even in tortures; as they did, who (Acts v. 41) *rejoiced* in suffering for His Name." (Theophyl.)

*again I say*] Translate, "**again I will say**" (fut.). He spares not to reiterate the exhortation (as he says, iii. 1, "to write the *same* things to me is not tedious").

"He doubles it to take away the scruple of those that might say, 'What, shall we rejoice in affliction?' Yes, I say [will say] again, Rejoice; so that it is not left to us to rejoice or not rejoice; but, whatever befalls us, we must always, at all times, rejoice in the Lord Who taketh care of us." (Geo. Herbert, 'Letter to his Mother.'—J.)

**5.** This *joy* springs from a union with Christ and conformity to His Life:—especially in the tranquil graces,—gentleness, moderation, patience.—J.

*Let your moderation* . . . .] There is no full English equivalent for the Greek word (τὸ ἐπιεικές). "Forbearance" comes nearest. The adj. is elsewhere rendered in A.V., "*patient*," "*gentle*," 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2,

Digitized by Google

6 Be careful for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.

---

&c. The derived noun (ἐπιείκεια), in N. T. peculiar to St. Paul, is found only in Acts xxiv. 4 (spoken by him), and 2 Cor. x. 1 ("*clemency*," "*gentleness*," A.V.). All these ideas are secondarily attached to this word; but its etymological and proper meaning is "that *yieldingness* which urges not its own rights to the uttermost"; hence *equity*, as corrective of mere justice (Aristot., 'Eth. N.,' V. x. 6). The word as compared with "meekness" (πραότης) belongs rather to *outward* conduct (Estius),—towards *others* (Bengel),—especially *inferiors* (Aquinas) (Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N. T.,' *s. v.*).

*unto all men*] They had perhaps in some degree incurred before the world the reproach of factiousness, of which the difference between Euodias and Syntyche was an instance. He bids them rather *shew forth in the eyes of all men* a spirit such as (2 Cor. x. 1, as above) he attributes to Christ Himself, of "yielding gentleness," willing to suffer wrong,—that all men may see and glorify God in them.

Or he may mean that this spirit is to be *exercised towards all men* impartially,—even (Chrys.) towards the enemies of the Cross.

*The Lord is at hand*] This sentence connects itself directly with the foregoing precept; but has relation also to that of the following *v.* (where see note.)—The nearness of Christ's Coming (anticipated above, iii. 20) ought to silence strife, and engender a spirit of forbearance. So James *v.* 8, "*Be patient* . . . for the coming of the Lord draweth *nigh* (ἤγγικε)."

Chrys., &c., understand the words to promise speedy judgment on the "enemies of the Cross" (iii. 18);—"Be forbearing towards such, but be not anxious because of them; Christ is coming to avenge you." But the reference back to those "enemies" seems too remote.

Some (as Neander) interpret "*at hand*" of the "*perpetual* nearness" of the Lord, as a motive to "gentleness." For this sense of "at hand" see Ps. xxxiii. [xxxiv.] 19 [18]; cxliv. [cxlv.] 18, "The Lord is *nigh*" (ἐγγὺς in LXX., as here).

(For this latter interpretation, cp. 1 Clem. R., XXI., and Bp. Jacobson's note.—J.)

But if the word be so interpreted, on the strength of these passages, "the Lord" is *the Father*, contrary to St. Paul's usage (that title, with him, always denoting *the Son*). Farther, it is to be observed that in the above texts from the Pss., the *persons to whom* "the Lord is nigh" are expressed. They are not therefore truly parallel to this, when "at hand" is used absolutely.—"*The Lord is nigh*," as an absolute statement, cannot be understood but of the Second Advent. The Church accordingly uses this passage (*vv.* 4–7) as an Advent Epist. The "*Maranatha*" ("the Lord cometh") of 1 Cor. xvi. 22, shews how the expression had become a Christian saying,—the "*watchword*" (Bp. Wordsworth) of the garrison of the City of God.

See, for this use of the advb. "*nigh*" (ἐγγύς), Joel ii. 1 (LXX.); Matt. xxiv. 32; Rom. xiii. 11; Rev. i. 3; xxii. 10; and cp. Barnab., 'Epist.,' XXI.—J.

6. *Be careful for nothing*] If "careful" retained its proper meaning "*full of care*," this rendering would admirably convey St. Paul's meaning. But as the word is now employed, merely as the opposite of *careless*, its use in this place tends to mislead. "**Be anxious**," "**solicitous**," represents the verb more truly. So 1 Cor. vii. 32, "I would have you *without carefulness*" (derived adj.).

*careful for nothing*] The *care* which the Christian ought to be without, is the care that distracts prayer: what he ought to have, is the care which, leading to prayer and relieved by prayer, will free him from the *anxious* care here deprecated.—J.

The same temper of mind, the same sense of the near approach of the Lord [or, of His present nearness,—if we so interpret], which produces "*forbearance*" in our relations with men, will produce also the resigned trust in God, which "casts all our cares on Him."

*in everything by prayer and supplication*] Of these two nouns, the latter is simply *supplication* for express benefits, whether to God or to man; the former is *prayer*,—to God only, but extending to the whole range through which the seeking soul addresses itself to Him, even without definite request. See Abp. Trench, 'Syn. N. T.,' *s. v.* Each noun here has the art., implying, "with *such* spirit of prayer, and *such* act of supplication [as each occasion as it arises shall require or suggest]."

*with thanksgiving*] Here, on the other hand, the noun has no art.; the reason apparently being that—whereas *prayer* is to spring out of the occasion as it comes—*thanksgiving* is to accompany prayer, not merely when express matter of thankfulness presents itself, but in *all* cases. Cp. 1 Thess. v. 18.

"Even for things that seem adverse we are to give thanks: for this is the mark of true Christian thankfulness. Other thanksgiving is of nature; this is of grace, and springs in a soul devoutly disposed towards God."

Digitized by Google

7 And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.

8 Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things *are* [1]honest, whatsoever things *are* just, whatsoever things *are* pure,

[1] Or, venerable.

---

Such is the comment of Chrys. here, and such was the spirit of his dying words, "Glory to God *for all things!*" (Pallad., 'Vita S. Chrys.,' XI.)—The Apostle himself abounds in this form of devotion, so that it stands first in this and in most of his Epp. See above, i. 4-9, for thanksgiving joined with prayer, and cp. Rom. i. 8, 9; &c.—It was *at Philippi* that he, with Silas, in prison, "*prayed* and *sang praises* unto God" (Acts xvi. 25).

*let your requests be made known*] "*Petitions*" (see Abp. Trench, as above) for particular boons wherever we have need. *Every* longing of the soul is to be laid before God. Herein is at once the relief for hearts laden with care, and a check on hearts drawn by evil or wandering desires.

*be made known*] True, He knows them already; but that is no reason why we should not be required to lay them before Him.—J.

*unto God*] Lit., "towards," *i.e.*, "**before God.**" Our petitions are in every case to be addressed *to Him:* for, even when we ask favour *of men*, we are in so doing to have respect to Him as the true Giver, in Whose Hand it is to move men's hearts.—To *men* our Christian temper is to "*be known*" (*v.* 5) by our conduct: to *God* our petitions are to "*be made known*" in prayer (Bengel).

7. *And the peace*] This "and" expresses *consequence*,—"**and so.**" Here is the result promised to prayer: not by any means always its specific fulfilment; but, in every case, the holy calm that comes of cares laid on God,—desires resigned to His Will,—a spirit thankfully conscious of His Love, and in communion with His Spirit.

*the peace of God*] No one of the meanings assigned to this expression,—peace *among brethren*,—peace *of conscience*,—peace *of reconciliation with God*,—is fully adequate. It includes each, but it is more than all, of these. It is "*God's peace*"; that which is His element; into which they that are His are privileged to enter, and in which He "will keep the mind that is stayed" in trust on Him (Isai. xxvi. 3). Dwelling in it, they are at peace with all men, in themselves, and with Him. Cp. Col. iii. 15, where His "peace" is joined, as here, with *thankfulness*.

*which passeth all understanding*] *I.e.*, "**surpasseth.**" It transcends the mind of man,—too limited in capacity to take it in, too perturbed by sin to mirror it truly. Only in acquiring the spirit of *prayer and thanksgiving* (last *v.*), and thence the habit of communing with Him and merging our wills in His, can we attain to know something of that "*Peace.*" "He who possesses it has more than he himself knows; more than he can express in word or thought." (Neander.)

Others explain, "the peace which can give comfort more than any reason can" (Meyer); or "which is far better than all self-assertion all anxious forethought" (Bp. Lightfoot). Of these, the latter assigns a forced meaning to the noun (νοῦς); and neither suits the spirit of the context nearly so well as the ordinary rendering. Cp., in confirmation of it, Eph. iii. 19, 20, where he writes of the "love of Christ that passeth knowledge," and of God's Power to do "above all that we ask or *think*" (νοοῦμεν).

*shall keep*] Better, "**shall guard,**" as in a stronghold. The civic and military allusion of *v.* 1, and of i. 27, is resumed. As a "Colony," Philippi was a sanctuary of the "*Roman Peace.*" In the Heavenly City (iii. 20) *God's peace*, as "the King's peace" in an earthly city, implies to all citizens dwelling loyally within its sphere, the healing of strife, the sense of security, and the sovereign's favour. "Peace within its walls," as in the "Jerusalem" of Ps. cxxii. 7, keeps guard. "A verbal paradox, for [*to guard*] (φρουρεῖν) is a warrior's duty" (Bp. Lightfoot).

*your hearts and minds*] More accurately, "**your hearts and your thoughts**":—the "*heart*" being regarded (as לב in Hebrew) as the seat not merely of feeling but of intellect; and the "*thoughts*" as its product.

*through Christ Jesus*] This "peace," coming "through Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1), subsisting in Him Who "is our peace" (Eph. ii. 14), has of Him its power to *guard* the heart. "**In Christ Jesus**" therefore is its efficacy, its sphere.—This is better than to explain, "shall keep your hearts [*so as to abide*] *in Christ.*"

8. *Finally . . .*] The movement to the conclusion, begun at iii. 1, and suspended through the intervening *vv.*, is now resumed; and with this brief but full summary of subjects for Christian meditation, and the ensuing call (*v.* 9) to Christian action, he closes the hortatory part of the Ep.

In the topics set forth in this *v.*, we are not to expect scientific arrangement, or exhaustive enumeration. Yet we cannot but perceive a certain order and completeness in its presen-

Digitized by Google

whatsoever things *are* lovely, whatsoever things *are* of good report; if *there be* any virtue, and if *there be* any praise, think on these things.

---

tation of the chief aspects of profitable thought, as traced in the following notes. The fact that the Ep. is addressed to Greeks chiefly, manifests itself in the method and fulness here observable; as well as in the terms employed,—none of them pertaining to the exclusively Christian vocabulary, most of them infrequent in N. T. and LXX., some found here only. Even to an English reader the whole cast and wording of the passage distinguish it perceptibly from (*e.g.*) such a summary of the Christian graces as that given Gal. v. 22, 23. (See Introd., § IV., B, 2, and note 1; *ib.*, C.)

*whatsoever things*] This "whatsoever," six times iterated, emphasizes the first six following heads;—the last two, pertaining to a different point of view, being introduced in a different form ("if there be any . . .").

*true*] Not to be limited (as by many) to revealed, nor even to moral, truth. Every form of truth is of God, and may be made to furnish matter for such Christian thought as shall actuate and shape Christian feeling and conduct.

*honest*] Rather "*venerable*" (as marg.), "**reverend**" (σεμνά). This word in N. T. first occurs here; afterwards only in the Pastoral Epp., to which likewise the use of its derivative noun is confined;—both being used with a definitely *religious* import (1 Tim. ii. 2; iii. 4, 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2, 7). This suits the original classical signification of the word, as belonging to *Divine* persons or things, "*inspiring religious reverence*."

*just*] "**Righteous**," in the fullest comprehension of the term. The word belongs equally to the language of heathen moralists, and to that drawn by Christian teachers from LXX.; but in the latter has wider compass of meaning.

*pure*] So A.V. rightly; (ἁγνά) not "*chaste*" merely, but more nearly "*holy*" (Vulg., &c., "*sancta*")—free from all that taints; as the advb. is used, i. 16. of purity of *motive*. The word (like σεμνός), pertains primarily to the *Divine* sphere, denoting the awful purity of *God*, or *saintly* purity derived from Him (as 1 John iii. 3). It is rare in N. T., chiefly in St. Paul,—its derived advb. and nouns (ἁγνῶς, ἁγνεία, ἁγνότης), in him only.

*lovely*] Such as, in a well-ordered heart, will naturally gender love (προσφιλῆ,—here only in N. T.). The quality denoted is that which Plato ('Phædr.,' XXXI. [250 d.]) attributes to Wisdom,—she would (he says) inspire love in men were she manifested to their eyes. It is what modern moralists describe as the "Beauty of Virtue," by which "good actions excite agreeable feelings in the mind of the spectator" (Dugald Stewart).

*of good report*] Lit., "well *speaking*" (εὔφημα,—here only in N. T., nowhere in LXX.). It is a word of peculiarly religious meaning, — "well-omened," "auspicious." Here it seems to denote things in their nature so excellent that to name them is a goodly and sacred thing. A.V. however (after Vulg., &c., "*bonæ famæ*") makes it "well *spoken of*";—cp. the cognate noun (εὐφημία) "*good report*," 2 Cor. vi. 8.

(See on the subject of regard for *good report* among men, Jer. Taylor, 'Holy Living,' II. 5, "Public fame . . . is the measure of good and evil in things indifferent."—J.)

Thus, under these six heads, he sets before them all that commends itself—(1, 2) as matter of *contemplation*, to reason and faith, as "*true*" and "*reverend*";—(3, 4) for the *conduct of life*, to the moral and religious sense, as "*righteous*" and "*pure*;"—(5, 6) in *the sight of men*, to affection and admiration, as "*lovable*" and "*of good name*." And it is to be noted that the six topics fall naturally into these pairs,—the former member of each pair being a word of merely human application [(1) ἀληθῆ, (3) δίκαια, (5) προσφιλῆ], while the latter (as above shewn) touches on the Divine [(2) σεμνά, (4) ἁγνά, (6) εὔφημα], pertaining primarily to the ideas and forms of the old religion. Herein we recognize an adaptation of his language to the associations of his Gentile readers;—analogous to his appeals to the principles of natural *religion*, Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 22–29; Rom. i. 19–21;—and of natural *morality*, Rom. ii. 14, 15.—In like manner, when he passes to the remaining two heads, he takes up the familiar terms of the old philosophy, *virtue*, and *approbation* (ἀρετή, ἔπαινος);—"*virtue*" including the first and second of the above pairs, "*praise*" the third.

*if* there be *any* . . .] Rather (as Alford), "**whatsoever virtue there is . . .**" By this expression (εἴ τις,—cp. ii. 1) he casts no doubt on the reality of *virtue* and *approbation*: on the contrary, he treats it as certain. He refers to these as accepted topics of Gentile wisdom, and adopts them into the Gospel. "The *virtue* you have been taught to aim at, the *approval* of good men that has been set up as your standard, these still keep in mind."

*virtue*] This word (ἀρετή) is nowhere else used by St. Paul; elsewhere in N. T. only by

Digitized by Google

9 Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you.

10 But I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at the last your care of me [1]hath flourished again; wherein ye were also careful, but ye lacked opportunity.

11 Not that I speak in respect of

[1] Or, *is revived.*

---

St. Peter,—1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3; *ib.* 5 (twice); but of *human* excellence, only in the last of these *vv.* In the LXX. it is found in its *human* application, only in Apocrypha (*e.g.*, Wisd. iv. 1). This infrequency is in marked contrast to its preeminent place (see *e.g.* Aristot. 'Eth. N.,' II. v., vi.) in the language of heathen ethics.

*praise*] Human approbation is similarly held up by the Apostle as an aim, Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21.

"We are not to think it enough to satisfy our own consciences; but we are to endeavour . . . to manifest our uprightness to the consciences of others." . . . "God hath ingrafted in our nature, as a spur to virtuous and laudable actions, an appetency of praise and glory; and expecteth that we should make use of it accordingly so far as it may be servient to those ends for which He gave it; and so as it be withal subservient to His Glory that gave it." (Sanderson, 'Sermons,' I. *Ad Aulam*, 31, 32.—J.)

Yet the "*praise*" which Christian morality owns as its supreme motive, is of a higher sphere,—that which "is not of men but of God" (Rom. ii. 29;—see also 1 Cor. iv. 5).

On *praise* and its relation to *virtue*, see Aristot., 'Eth. N.,' I. xii. 6; xiii. 20.

*think on these things*] This precept implies that we *can*, and therefore *are bound to*, control our thoughts. But to "think on" is not to *contemplate* merely,—not such speculation apart from action, such "going over the theory of virtue in one's thoughts and drawing fine pictures of it," as Bp. Butler warns us against ('Analogy,' I. v.). Translate rather "**consider**" (λογίζεσθε, lit., "take *account of*"),—as principles for the guidance of life. Thus we have in the word not an antithesis to "those things *do*" (next *v.*) but the antecedent to it,—the thought which precedes, suggests, and directs action.—"To restore a commonplace truth to its first uncommon lustre, you need only translate it into action. But to do this, you must have reflected on its truth." (S. T. Coleridge, 'Aids to Refl.,' *Introd. Aph.* III.)

**9.** *Those things, which ye have both learned . . . in me*] "**What things also ye learned and received [from me] and heard and saw in me** (scil., when I was with you,—aor.) **these things do.**" Of the four copulatives (καί) in this sentence, the first is not "both" (as A. V.), but "**also,**" continuing the sense from last *v.*, by adding "these things *do*" to "*think on* these things." The second and the fourth couple the verbs into two pairs, the former relating to his teaching, the latter to his example. The third connects the two pairs.

*learned, and received*] Of these verbs, the former represents the Gospel as a *lesson* taught; the latter, as a *charge* conveyed.

*heard, and seen in me*] That is "learned by the example of my *words* and *acts.*" "Heard" relates not to his ministerial teaching, but to his ordinary speech as he went among them.—See, on the subject of his example, note on iii. 17.

*do*] See last note on *v.* 8.

*and the God of peace*] So Rom. xv. 33; &c.—Cp. the opening words of *v.* 7. The "*and*" here, as there, expresses consequence —"and *so.*" There, resignation, prayer, and thankfulness, lead to "the peace of God." Here, a life of Christian thought issuing in action, ensures the Presence of "the God of peace,"—Who gives that peace which is His.

10–19. Acknowledgment of their Gift.

**10.** He now passes to that which, though it was the occasion of the writing of this Ep., he has hitherto but indirectly touched on (ii. 25; see also i. 5)—the matter of the gifts sent to him by the Philippians. And the expression of his thanks for these,—dignified and delicate, tender towards the givers, and devout towards Him Who inspired and will reward their bounty,—and of his feelings in respect of temporal wants and their supply, occupies this and the succeeding *vv.*—See Introd., § IV., C.

*But I rejoiced*] "But" expresses the transition to a new subject. "I rejoiced" (scil., when he received their bounty,—aor.).

*rejoiced in the Lord*] According to his own reiterated precept (iii. 1; iv. 4). His joy was moved by their act, but rises from the human sphere into the Divine. He "rejoices," and "*greatly;*" not merely in the sense of personal relief,—not even in the proof of their affection;—but in their bounty as a vehicle of his Lord's goodness, and as an evidence of their Christian faith and love.

*that now at the last your care of me hath flourished again*] Lit., "**that now at last ye flourished again as concerning caring**

Digitized by Google

want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, *therewith* to be content.

12 I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: every where and in all things I am in-

---

**for me"** (*scil.*, when they sent their gifts—aor., ἀνεθάλετε, "ye put forth fresh growth"). They are like a tree reviving from its winter, to put forth shoots (kind purposes), and to yield fruit (kind deeds—below, *v.* 17). He implies that such proofs of life have been for some time dormant; but guards against all semblance of reproach by ascribing their shortcoming to their circumstances, not to their will.—The verb is best taken thus intransitively. To translate it," "ye revived your care for me" (transit., with τὸ . . . φρονεῖν as accus. after it) is grammatically admissible; but would denote *revived goodwill*, and not (as the delicacy of the passage requires) merely *renewed ability*, to aid. The interpretation first given seems more in keeping with the spirit of what follows, and with the gentle courtesy of the writer in avoiding even to hint blame in acknowledging a benefit.

[This verb (ἀναθάλλειν) occurs in LXX., sometimes intrans., as Ps. xxvii. [xxviii.] 7; Wisd. iv. 4;—sometimes trans., as Ezek. xvii. 24; Ecclus. i. 18; l. 10.—J.]

*wherein*] **"On behalf of which"** (ἐφ' ᾧ),—scil., *my welfare* (anteced. implied in the foregoing). "Your bounty was a renewed token of your care for my welfare;—and you were, I am sure, caring for it all along." See Note at end of ch.

*ye lacked opportunity*] Rather, **"ye lacked means"** (ἠκαιρεῖσθε). So Chrys.,—explaining that such was the colloquial use of this very rare verb. Probably the proper and primary meaning is "ye lacked *due season*,"—scil., for buds or fruit (so Bp. Wordsworth). This preserves in the verb the natural sense of the word (καιρός) whence it is derived, and maintains the metaphor of the reviving *tree* (above).—"I welcomed the renewal of your friendly care as one welcomes new leaves and fruit after the winter: and I doubt not that such care was present with you all the time, though the ability to shew it in deeds was wanting;—that the buds were ready to put forth, had the season permitted, had outward conditions been propitious."

This "*lack of means*" is explained by what we read of their present "conflict" [persecution] (i. 30),—and of the "great trial of affliction" [also persecution], and "deep poverty," of the Macedonian Churches, a few years before (2 Cor. viii. 1, 2): while the commendation of their "liberality" *then*, in the midst of their troubles, to the poor brethren (*ib.* 2, 3), refutes the idea (which is inconsistent with all that we know of them) that the Philippians can have been lacking in *goodwill*. See Introd., § IV., C.

**11.** *Not that I speak*] A farther guarding against misconstruction. "Do not suppose me to complain of privations,—or to imply that care for my needs has been lacking on your part. I am satisfied with my lot (*vv.* 11–13), and with your kindness (14–18)."

*for I have learned*] Our idiom requires this rendering, rather than the verbally accurate, "*I learned*" (ἔμαθον, aor.),—scil., when he became a *disciple* of Christ (μαθητής, Acts ix. 26; cp. Matt. x. 24). *Contentment* was part of the great lesson of renunciation which he then "learned." The "I" is emphatic,—"*I*, whatever others may desire, have learned to be satisfied."

*in whatsoever state I am*] Again a rendering hardly accurate, yet substantially conveying the meaning. Lit., **"in what state I am"** (indic., ἐν οἷς εἰμί;—so Vulg., &c., "*in quibus sum:*"—A. V. would require conj. with ἄν). But though speaking thus of his *present* state he but uses it as an instance to exemplify his habitual temper. Thus the sense is nearly as in A. V.; with this shade of difference, that the original better conveys the idea of daily trials met, each as it comes, by the supply of strength sufficient for the day.

*content*] In earthly things he is satisfied to be as he is; in spiritual things, he presses ever onward for higher attainment (iii. 13, 14). "Content" (αὐτάρκης), again a familiar term of the Greek philosophy, for which see Aristot. 'Eth. N.,' I. vii. 6,—here only in N. T.,—properly **"self-sufficing,"** thence "independent," "satisfied with one's condition." When he asserts for himself such self-sufficingness, it is to be understood as absolute towards men only,—not towards Him Who said to him "My grace *is sufficient* (ἀρκεῖ) for thee" (2 Cor. xii. 9). Similarly, 2 Cor. ix. 8, he uses the derived noun (αὐτάρκεια,—A.V., "*sufficiency*") of such relative independence, bestowed by God.

**12.** *I know both how to . . .* ] He knows not merely *what it is* to meet such circumstances, but *how* to comport himself under them. This *knowledge* is the sequel of the lesson which (last *v.*) he claims to "have *learned*,"—to use abundance with moderation, to bear want with patience, in both to be thankful.

*both*] Rather **"also,"**—ascending from "I learned" of last *v.* to I "know," of this.

*to be abased . . . to abound*] The former

Digitized by Google

structed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need.

13 I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.

14 Notwithstanding ye have well done, that ye did communicate with my affliction.

15 Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me

---

verb (as appears from the opposition in which it is placed to the latter) is here used in the limited meaning "to be cast down [*by poverty*]." In the next sentence we have "*to abound*" again, coupled with its proper opposite, "*to suffer need.*"

*everywhere and in all things*] Lit., "**in every thing and in all things,**" (as we say) "in each and all." His experience is both special in kind and universal in extent.

*I am instructed*] Lit., "*I have been initiated*"— so Old Lat., "*imbutus sum*" (μεμύημαι,—here only in N. T., nowhere in LXX.)—another word of the old religion, belonging to the *Mysteries: i.e.*, "I have attained full experience;"—scil., as follows, in plenty and in want.—Note the progression He "*learned*" the lesson; "*knows*" how to act on it; "*has been initiated*" by full experience in what it implies.

*to be full and* . . . ] Lit., "to be *foddered*," —thence generally "**to be full-fed.**" This verb, and "to be hungry," are special instances of the more general "to abound and to suffer need" following.

Christians are not to be like the Israelites; who knew not how "*to be hungry*," for they "said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?" (Ps. lxxviii. 19);—nor yet how "*to be full*," for they "waxed fat and kicked" (Deut. xxxii. 15). (Theophyl.)

**13.** *I can do* . . . ] "**I have strength for all things, in Him that enableth me**" (the weight of authority requiring the omission of "*Christ*"). Observe (1) the passive strength *to bear*, (2) that strength subsisting *in Christ*, (3) the *spiritual power imparted* by Him,—here conveyed;—but lost in "I can *do*," "*through* Christ," "*strengtheneth*"—of A. V.—For latter verb, cp. Acts ix. 22.

Along with the *lesson*, the *knowledge*, the *initiation* (*vv.* 11, 12),—the *power* to live by them is in him. For it, he is content to depend on Christ; independent though he has declared himself to be of all else.

**14.** *Notwithstanding ye have well done*] Though thus content in himself, and in his Lord Who is his strength, he will not be supposed insensible to their benefits. "**Yet** [though I am satisfied to forego human relief] **ye did well**" (in sending me the tokens of your sympathy).

*ye did communicate with* . . . ] He commends their act rather because of the *fellow-feeling* evinced in it, than of the actual service rendered. The latter he could have done without; the former is welcome and precious to him. To understand "communicate" of their *giving* merely, is to lower the tone of the whole passage: it means to "have fellowship" (Bp. Ellicott). Cp. the cognate nouns, i. 5, 7.

**15.** *Now ye Philippians know*] Indicat. (not imperat., as A. V. seems to suggest). Partly to emphasize his thanks, partly to reassure them of his loving willingness to receive bounty at their hands, he reminds them of former gifts given by them and accepted by him.—"[Not now only have you relieved me,] **but** (δὲ) besides, as you remember, from the very first you supplied my wants, when no other Church was ready, or was admitted, so to do."

*in the beginning of the gospel*] *I.e.* "in the earliest days of my preaching to you" (Acts xvi. 12, *sqq.*), about ten years before; a long time, in the then infant life of the Church. For this phrase, cp. 1 Clem. R., XLVII. (where see Cotelier's note); also i. 5, above.

*when I departed from Macedonia*] As related, Acts xvii. 14. The verb (aor.) seems naturally to relate to the occasion of that departure; and to fix it as the time when contributions were sent to him by them. This agrees with the words just before, which imply an *early* date; and falls in equally well with the following *v.*, where we read of a still earlier act of their bounty, done while he was still in Macedonia.—Others however translate, "I *had* departed," and understand that they sent gifts to him, *after* he had left Macedonia, while he was in Achaia (Acts xviii. 1–18); —scil., by the hands of the "brethren which came from Macedonia," who "supplied that which was lacking to him" at Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 9). So Paley, H.P., VII. iii. His admirable statement of the coincidences among these documents, holds good in the main under either of the above interpretations.—See above, Introd., § II., B, 2; § IV., C.

*communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving*] Lit., "**towards the account of . . .**" The gifts are conceived as entered in an account; in which they appear as *givers*, and (consequently) he as *receiver*. So

Digitized by Google

as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.

16 For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity.

17 Not because I desire a gift: but I desire fruit that may abound to your account.

18 But [1] I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things *which were sent* from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, wellpleasing to God.

19 But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus.

[1] Or, *I have received all.*

---

Theod. Mops., "They gave, he received." This figure does not imply (as some imagine) a regular book with debtor and creditor sides;—still less (as Meyer) two books, one kept by each party. Nor does it suggest (as Chrys., &c.) a rendering of *carnal* things in return for *spiritual*;—an idea imported here from 1 Cor. ix. 11, but plainly foreign to the context, which relates exclusively to *temporal* gifts.

**16.** *For even in Thessalonica*] Confirmatory of the early date to which he traces back their kindness. "You alone have been liberal from the first; *for even* [before I left your province, and while I was still] in Thessalonica, you sent more than once to relieve my need." It was the first city in which he sojourned (Acts xvii. 1, 2—see notes there) after leaving Philippi. Their bounty was therefore very prompt. (This is better than to explain, as Chrys., &c.—"Even in the metropolis he received sustenance from the smaller city.")—Cp. 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8; where he affirms that during the sojourn here referred to, he avoided to be "chargeable" to the Thessalonians. Paley (as above), instead of "for even," renders "*and that*";—*i.e.*, "You remember that you sent gifts at my departure . . . *and that* you had done so before." But the position of the conjns. is against this; and the inverted order of the incidents, intelligible with the former rendering, is thus unaccounted for.

**17.** *Not because I desire a gift: but I desire fruit*] Translate, "**Not that** (as *v.* 11) **I seek after the gift, but I seek after the fruit.**"—"It is not the gift I desire, for the gift's sake;—what I do desire is, the fruit that shall redound to the givers' good,—for their sake."—His sensitive spirit shews itself (as *v.* 11, where see note) in this clearing of himself from all surmise of sordid motive.

*fruit that may abound* . . . ] "**The fruit that increases,**"—lit., "*multiplies.*" "The *fruit*,"—*i.e.*, as above, i. 11, and elsewhere throughout N. T. (*e.g.*, Matt. vii. 16), the *results* of Christian life,—good works, especially *bounty* (as Rom. xv. 28). That which, as received by him, was "*the gift*;" is, as yielded by them, "*the fruit*" (of their faith and love). This agrees with Scriptural usage, —and also with the simile of the "reviving" tree (*v.* 10, where see note),—better than to explain "fruit" (with most) of their *reward* hereafter. Though the idea of such reward is undoubtedly in the passage, it lies not in the word "*fruit*," but in the appended words, "that increases *to your account*."—"I desire to see the *fruit* of your faith (your bounty), which as it *increases*, secures for you an ever increasing recompence, set *to your account* in Heaven."

**18.** *But I have all, and* . . . ] Lit., "**I have to the full**" (ἀπέχω). The verb belongs to the idea of the "*account*" (*v.* 15), and implies the receipt of a *full* amount. So Matt. vi. 2; Gen. xliii. 22 [23] (LXX.);—see Hammond on Mark xiv. 41.—"I am sufficed; nay more, **I overflow, I have been filled.**"

*of Epaphroditus*] See ii. 25.

*an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable* . . . . ] Another aspect of their gift, apart from its temporal value. He has already welcomed it,—(1) as a token of sympathetic "*communion*" (*v.* 14), (2) as "*fruit*" sure of heavenly recompence (*v.* 17); *here* (higher still), it is accepted by God as "a *sacrifice*."—"Lo, how high does he uplift their gift! It is not I (he says) that have received it, but God through me." (Chrys.)—"As ye gave to Epaphroditus, and he to me; so through me did God receive your gift as an oblation." (Theodt.)

The "odour of sweet smell" is the "**savour**" of a *sacrifice*,—as Gen. viii. 21 (LXX.); cp. Eph. v. 2; also 2 Cor. ii. 14–16. For the "sacrifice *wellpleasing*," cp. Rom. xii. 1 (where A. V. renders same adj. "*acceptable*"); Hebr. xiii. 16 (where the derived verb is used):—in the former place the "sacrifice" being of *self*,—in the latter (nearly as here) of *good works*.

**19.** *But my God shall supply* . . . ] "*My* God,"—see i. 3, and note. There it is "I *thank* my God *for you*;" here, "my God *will requite you*."—"He Who is *my* God, Who therefore accepts your gifts to me as oblations to Himself (last *v.*),—will take upon Himself to recompense you, and that in superabundant measure. You out of your *deep poverty* (2 Cor. viii. 2), have filled my

Digitized by Google

20 Now unto God and our Father *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.

21 Salute every saint in Christ Jesus. The brethren which are with me greet you.

22 All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household.

23 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you all. Amen.

---

*one* need; (τὴν χρείαν, *v.* 16, cp. ii. 25;—need in *one* form); He out of His *Riches* will **fill your every need"** (πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν):—so, "I have been *filled*" (last *v.*).

*according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus*] Translate, "**in Christ Jesus.**"—The recompence will consist in being "*in Christ;*" it will be *rich*, out of "His Riches" Who gives it; its scene will be His Kingdom "in *glory.*" All this points to a reward not merely spiritual, but future and eternal (not, as many interpret, present and temporal),—the "reward in Heaven" (Matt. v. 12), the "recompence at the Resurrection of the just" (Luke xiv. 14), which the Lord Himself promised. Though "*every* need" includes *earthly* wants, the supply here promised is not earthly but heavenly,—the Divine fulness in which "every need shall be filled."

20. CLOSING ASCRIPTION.

*Now unto God and our Father*] A doxology inspired by the elevating prospect of last *v.*—Translate rather, "**our God and Father,**"- the prefixed art. and the subjoined pron. belonging to both nouns. So Gal. i. 4 (in the Greek):—cp. "the God and Father of our Lord," 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3 (A. V. in the latter place, though not in the former).—Observe, "*our* God,"—not, as in last *v.*, "*my* God." There, in His special relation to His Apostle, He will reward them for services done to him; here, He is set forth for the common adoration of both.

be *glory*] "**Is the Glory**" (with art., as usual in such ascriptions,—*e.g.*, Rom. xi. 36)—scil., that glory which as His Attribute and Element is here ascribed to Him: "*is,*" not "*be,*" being supplied, as it is in the Doxology appended (Matt. vi. 13) to the Lord's Prayer. See on this, Bp. Lightfoot's note on Gal. i. 5.

21–23. SALUTATIONS AND BENEDICTION.

**21.** *Salute every saint in Christ Jesus*] The words "in Christ Jesus" are to be joined with "saint," as in the expression (i. 1) "*saints in Christ Jesus*" (see for numerous like instances, Rom. xvi. 3, &c.);—rather than with "Salute" (though Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, suggest the latter connection). "*Salute in Christ Jesus*" would merely express the religious character of the greeting; "*saints in Christ Jesus*" addresses it to those who "have been *sanctified* in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 2).

*The brethren which are with me*] Scil., Timothy and his other immediate companions and colleagues. He owns them *all* as "*brethren*";—yet see ii. 20, 21.

**22.** *All the saints*] All the Christians of Rome,—as well as the personal associates spoken of in preceding *v.*

*chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household*] Not members of the Imperial *family* (as we use the word) or kindred, nor of the Prætorian *guard;* but persons belonging, as slaves or freedmen, to the Palace of Nero. The term "household" is well chosen to render the Greek (Lat., "*familia*"); as including all such, from officials of high place down to the lowest menials.—We here learn that the Gospel, at the time of the writing of this Ep., had reached to those who were, in higher or lower capacity, about the Emperor's person; and, in the words of Calvin (quoted by Meyer), had "penetrated into that abyss of all crime and infamy."—"History has few stranger contrasts than when it shews us Paul preaching Christ under the walls of Nero's Palace." (Dean Howson, 'Life of St. Paul,' XXVI.)

Why these persons especially ("chiefly") should salute the Philippians, does not appear. But the Apostle's motive in transmitting their greeting, is readily explained. It would cheer the Philippians, as shewing, (1) that the Gospel had made its way to the Imperial centre, (2) that even in the Court the example was set of risking all for Christ, (3) that his report of them had interested even distant strangers in their welfare. (Chrys.)

See Bp. Lightfoot's interesting discussion (Note, *Cæsar's Household*, p. 169), in which, by comparing certain sepulchral inscriptions, found in *Columbaria* near Rome, with the salutations in Rom. xvi., he shews it to be probable that of the "brethren" in that chapter, some at least belonged to the Imperial "*familia:*" who therefore, being known to the Apostle as Christians when he wrote the Ep. to the Romans, A.D. 58 (three years before his arrival in Rome), may well have been known by name, at the date of this Ep. (62, 63), to the Philippians.

**23.** *The grace of our Lord*] The "grace

Digitized by Google

which He bestows, is in this, as in all St. Paul's Epistles,—in all his thoughts,—the beginning and the end (cp. i. 2).—J.

*with you all*] Read, "**with your spirit**," as the weight of evidence requires. So Gal. vi. 18; Philem. 25;—cp. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Most of the other Epp. end with words similar to the reading of A. V. (as above,—also of Rec.), which no doubt was adopted from a desire for assimilation.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on CHAP. IV.

3. *yokefellow*] Of the many theories that have been advanced as to the person so addressed, one, first stated by Clem. Alex. ('Strom.,' III. 6) is to be noted for its strangeness,—that St. Paul's *wife* is meant;—which is inconsistent with what he says of himself, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8,—and with the masc. adj. γνήσιε. Renan however ('St. Paul,' VI., p. 148) adopts this, adding the conjecture that this wife was Lydia! (Acts xvi. 14, 15, 40.) Others have suggested the *husband*, or the *brother*, of one of the women;—but neither theory is tenable in the absence of any note of his relation to one of them more than the other. Others again *St. Peter*, or *St. Barnabas*, or *St. Luke*, or *Silas* (Acts xvi. 19–40). Theophyl., *the jailor* (*ib.* 23–34).

*Clement*] Origen's statement is supported by Eusebius ('H. E.,' III. 4, 15), Epiphanius ('Hæres.,' XXVII. 6), Jerome, 'De Viris Ill.,' 15), and other ancient writers. Against these positive authorities is to be set the silence of Irenæus, who, in writing of Clement R. ('Adv. Hæres.,' III. 3—see Euseb., 'H. E.,' V. 6) does not refer to this *v.*; though he has just before cited 2 Tim. iv. 21, for the mention of Linus (Bp. Jacobson, 'Patres Apost.,' Introd., p. xi., note).—In the same passage, however, he distinctly connects Clement R. with St. Paul, by stating that he "had seen and conversed with (συμβεβληκὼς) the Apostles" (scil., St. Peter and *St. Paul*); so far corroborating Origen. (See Bryennios, 'Clement of Rome,' Προλεγόμ., B', έ—ή. See on the other side Bp. Lightfoot's Note, *Clement*, 'Philipp.,' p. 166; also the article, *Clement of Rome*, in 'Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography.'

*the book* . . . .] Cowper ('Sonnet to Mary Unwin'), perhaps unconsciously, adopts this thought,—

"—There is a Book,
On which the eyes of God not rarely look,
A chronicle of actions just and bright;
There all thy deeds, my faithful Mary, shine;
And since thou own'st that praise, I spare thee mine."

10. *wherein ye were also*] The construction above given, though irregular, is simple and clear; and is better than (with some) to make "*me*" the anteced., translating ἐφ' ᾧ, "*for whom*;"—or (with others) to take ἐφ' ᾧ adverbially, "even as." The relat. ᾧ would regularly have for its anteced. the sentence τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν;—which would yield the unmeaning result, "ye were caring on behalf caring for me." But this is avoided by supplying "my welfare" (as above).

Meyer makes τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ accusat. of object after φρονεῖν, and anteced. to ᾧ,—"ye prospered anew, [so as] to consider that which concerns me"; thus obtaining a regular construction,—but a forced one, considering the position of φρονεῖν.

Digitized by Google

# COLOSSIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



I.

1. AMONG the witnesses of the first great Pentecost of the Church, dwellers in *Phrygia* are mentioned (Acts ii. 10). Phrygia soon appears among the provinces of Asia Minor, to which the Gospel was carried. After the Council of Jerusalem Paul and his companions are said to have "gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia."[2] After his departure from Corinth and Ephesus, he went over "all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples" (Acts xviii. 23).[3]

A glance at the map will show that, in a rich plain, watered by the Meander, were three towns, situated at the points of a triangle. A fourth, called Apamea, has also been mentioned. (Leusden, 'Philol. Hebræo-Græc.,' P. 177.) These towns, once of importance, were so close to each other that a traveller could without much difficulty have visited them in the course of a single day, and all three are mentioned in this Epistle — viz. Laodicea, Colosse, and Hierapolis (iv. 13, 15, 16).

2. Phrygia was largely evangelized by *intermediaries*. St. Paul had made converts from these three cities of the Lycus, one of whom—himself a native of Colosse (ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, Coloss. iv. 12), Epaphras—had preached the Gospel to his fellow-citizens. He had an oversight of, or at least ministered laboriously for, the three cities of Colosse, Laodicea, and Hierapolis (iv. 13). He was a disciple of St. Paul, and must have felt to St. Paul,—like another Colossian, Philemon (ver. 2),—that he owed his very being to Christ's minister (Philemon v. 19). The passage in Coloss. ii. 1 (see note) seems to many critics almost decisive against St. Paul's personal connexion with the Colossian Church.[1] This inference is,

[1] It would be more accurate to write Colossæ; but, on the whole, it seemed preferable to retain the familiar Colosse.

[2] διελθόντες τὴν Φρυγίαν, Acts xvi. 6.

[3] For argument that the journey did *not* include a personal visit to Colosse—which, as he maintains, is excluded by the whole tone of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians—see Bp. Lightfoot, Pp. 23, *seqq.*

[1] The fact that St. Paul had never personally seen the Colossian Church—doubted by some

Digitized by Google

perhaps, strengthened by observing the different tone perceptible in his addresses to churches which he himself had seen and founded (*e.g.* Galat. iv. 13; Philipp. ii. 12). It is quite true that individuals are mentioned at the close of the Colossian letter. But, it will be observed that several of these are touched upon in the sort of tone in which we write to friends about individuals presumably unknown to them (Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, Luke iv. 10, 11, 14). Onesimus and Epaphras, however, were well known to them (iv. 7, 12). It has been supposed that Timothy (simply spoken of as Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός i. 1) may have had an active share in laying the foundations of their church.

3. The Church of the Colossians, then, if we adopt the conclusion of modern critics generally, was not directly and personally founded by St. Paul. But *two* circumstances at this time caused him to look, with spiritual gaze, wistfully and affectionately to a Church whose members he had not seen with the eye of the flesh (ii. 1, 5). (1.) A visit from Epaphras had filled him with distress. The Church of the Colossians was indeed free from *disorder*. It stood in a fair organization, which gave the Apostle pleasure. There was not wanting a solid core of objective belief (see on τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα, Coloss. ii. 5, *inf.*). Still, the very air which blew over the Lycus —the old traditions of the place—the intermixture of Jewish and Gentile elements, alarmed him. For he heard of the formidable growth of a peculiarly compounded Gnostic heresy—partly philosophical, partly Judaizing, partly angelolatrous or demonolatrous—which had arisen among them, and was terrifying some by its ardent proselytizers (ii. 8), and its demands for an austere asceticism (ii. 23); attracting others by its claims to depth and mystic insight (ii. 8, 18. See on this subject, Notes *infra* on ii. 8, *seqq.*).

(2.) Another circumstance which directed St. Paul's thoughts towards Colosse was of a different character. A slave, Onesimus, had fled as a runaway to Rome, either to hide himself in the solitude of the great city, or to see St. Paul. Three Epistles were written and despatched, one to Colosse, one to Laodicea, one to an individual Colossian, the master of Onesimus—Philemon. The churches of the two cities were to exchange their Epistles for the purpose of public reading in the assembly (iv. 16). It seems in the highest degree probable that the letter of which a copy was sent to Laodicea was a sort of circular to the Asiatic Churches, and the same which, from the metropolitan Church, passed into the Canon as the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Colossians enjoyed the blessing and privilege of an Epistle of their own. They might well be content with the Laodicean copy of the Apostle's circular.[1]

4. It has often appeared somewhat perplexing that the Apostle, while in captivity, should have been in a position to send messages and letters to distant Churches. But several passages from the Epistles of the Captivity confirm the emphatic closing words of the Acts of the Apostles, and show that for a considerable part of it at least, St. Paul could teach the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all *confidence* and without *hindrance* (μετὰ παῤῥησίας, ἀκωλύτως, Acts xxviii. 31). While waiting for the definite judgment of the Emperor's tribunal, to which he had appealed, he enjoyed a measure of indulgence, which approached to liberty in some respects. A knot of friends gathered round him. New acquaintances and disciples were found. Delegates came to consult or to sympathize from distant churches. It was a circle, whose members were continually changing and in motion. It was renewed by the coming and going of

commentators—was advocated by many ancient expositors. *E.g.* the author of the 'Synops. Script. S.' attributed to Athanasius writes of this Epistle, ταύτην ἀποστέλλει ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, οὐχ ἑωρακὼς μὲν αὐτοὺς, ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν. (Athanas. Opp. iv. 420, edit. Migne. So Pelag. (apud S. Hieron.) "This he shews i. 4, and again ii. 1."—Theodore of Mopsuestia, 'Minor Epp. of St. Paul,' by H. B. Swete, i. 253.

[1] See note *infra* on iv. 16. It may be added that the form of the Apostle's expression about this letter—not τὴν πρὸς Λαοδικέας, but τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας—led Chrysost., Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Peshito version, and others, to suppose that the Epistle in question was written by the Laodiceans to St. Paul. The first mention of the forged letter is probably in Theodore of Mopsuestia (edit. Swete, pp. 310–311). See also Jacobi (Procem. ad Col. ii. iv.).

Digitized by Google

inquirers and messengers. It was a society at once for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts, and for deepening the spiritual life of its members—a school of Christian theology and Christian missions, whose greatest missionary was also its master theologian. The "lodging," (ξενία, Acts xxviii. 23), the place where he was in "free custody," became a church. In Philippians it is a source of joy to St. Paul that his imprisonment, all his present circumstances (τὰ καθ' ἐμέ), must tend rather than otherwise (μᾶλλον) to the progress of the Gospel.[1] When a man so pure, tender, and noble, gives up everything for a cause, attention must be called to it. The impression of that high enthusiasm passed from heart to heart. The chains which he bore "became manifest in Christ." The soldiers of the Emperor's body-guard, who had to keep watch over him, saw them in their relation to Christ. Each relief, day by day told off, added to the number. Not only was this witness given to the Prætorian Guard—it was given in a sense, "to all the rest of the city" (καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ver. 13), so that the great majority of believers (τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ver. 14) actually acquired a stronger confidence from his very bonds. Nor was this all. Gifts and messages began to come to and fro. In one passage of Philippians he is full of a joy which he knows is above nature (ἐχάρην ἐν Κυρίῳ, Philipp. iv. 10) on account of presents sent to him from Philippi. To some it has seemed, from one beautiful word,[1] as if the Philippian deputation had arrived with their gifts when the breath of the Italian spring was on the old man's cheek—as if he thought of them as having had a spring-like burst of loving care after a winter of unwilling unfruitfulness. Not that they were without loving care. It *was* felt, (καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε, assuredly you did so think and feel, iv. 10) but the season of exuberance was not come. The "winter" of inaction from the chill of circumstances is made "glorious *spring*" to him. It would seem from this passage that, after a time, certain restrictions were removed. None of those who came from Asia Minor, or elsewhere, to visit the master, were implicated with him, or submitted to any minute police inspection, or obliged to appear with him. There may have been some caution observed about writing certain facts; but, on the whole, there was no restriction against sending letters This free admission of friends—this circle of which we know several names[2]—this sending of gifts and messages to and fro—would seem to show that the captivity, for a considerable period at least, was not very rigorous.[3]

[1] The language popularly used about the "Philippians, the Epistle of joy, being written from a dungeon," and a misapprehension of St. Paul's meaning when he speaks of his "chains" or of his being a prisoner, have given rise to a confusion, which has caused the difficulty referred to in this section. The dungeon came later in the Apostle's career. The "Tullianum," the lowest depth of the Mamertine prison, excavated from the tufa under the Capitol, has been visited by every one who enters the little Church of S. Pietro in Carcere. There the memories of the Catilinarian conspirators, of Jugurtha, of Sejanus, of Simon Bar-Gioras, are strangely blended with the obstinate tradition that St. Peter and St. Paul were bound to the pillar which is pointed out. The external features of the "Robur" are eloquently described by Sallust (camera lapideis fornicibus vincta; sed incultu, tenebris, odore fœda, atque terribilis ejus facies —*Catilin.* IV.); the general impression has been powerfully caught by Dickens in his notes of his tour in Italy. With such a spot the Epistles of the first Roman captivity can have no connexion, however strongly it may present itself, as we read, 2 Tim. i. 8, 12; ii. 9; iv. 6, 8. Cf. 2 St. Peter i. 12–16.

## II.

1. Outward scenery leaves little impression upon the letters of St. Paul. The most vivid and accurate description of it hardly makes us understand *him* better.[4]

[1] ἀνεθάλετε: ἀναθάλλω in LXX. is used transitively with accusative of thing produced, cf. Eccles. xi. 18; Ezek. xi. 24, κ.τ.λ.—In the construct. ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν, the infinitive may be made grammatically equivalent to a substantive by means of the article (Winer, Pt. iii. §§ xliv. 4, p. 340). For a different, and, probably, truer explanation, see Notes on Philipp. iv. 10.

[2] Timothy, Mark, Luke, Aristarchus, Tychichus, Jesus Justus, Demetrius (or Demas), Onesimus. (Philem. v. 24; Ephes. vi. 21; Coloss. i. 1; iv. 7, 10, 11, 14.)

[3] See Aubé, *Hist. des Persécutions de l'Église*, Tom. i. pp. 64, 65.

[4] *Contrast* Goethe's saying: "He who wishes to understand the poet must go to the poet's country."

Digitized by Google

More especially is this the case with an Epistle which has so little that is purely local and personal as that to the Colossians. It seems, in some degree, to stand among the other writings of St. Paul, like the shape of the Apostle St. John in the vision of the great Italian poet, without distinguishable human features, from the blaze of the glory of Christ in which it is immersed. "The portion of the lot of the saints" of which he speaks is not described from any memory of the glorious landscape of the valley of the Meander and Lycus; it "lieth in the light" which is uncreated (i. 12). But the representation of the outward surroundings of those who are addressed in Scripture is a craving of the modern spirit. Such representations enable us to understand better, if not the writer *directly*, yet the writer through those whom he addresses, with their minds necessarily moulded and coloured by the context of their climate and history. And we may here, at least, borrow largely from a traveller and critic, who, if he seems to be influenced by an almost personal malignity against St. Paul, is, at least, a vivid interpreter of scenes which he has visited, and brings to his work large stores of reading, as well as much brilliancy of colouring.

"A rich canton of southern Phrygia,"[1]—writes M. Renan,—"in particular, the small basin of the Lycus,[2] a tributary of the Meander, saw some active Christian centres formed within it. Three towns very close to each other—Colossæ or Colassæ, Laodicea upon the Lycus, and Hierapolis—filled it with life.

"Colosse, which in old days was the most important, appeared to decline; it was a town which remained faithful to ancient ways, and which did not renew itself. Laodicea and Hierapolis, on the contrary, became, in consequence of the Roman empire, very considerable cities.[3] The very soul of all this beautiful country is Mount Cadmus (*Baba-Dagh* and *Chonas-Dagh*), the patriarch of all the mountains of Western Asia—a gigantic mass, full of dark precipices, and keeping its snows all the year round. The waters which flow down from it freshen, upon one of the slopes of the valley, orchards filled with fruit-trees, traversed by rivers full of fish, and enlivened by storks which are quite tame. The other side is quite given up to the strangest freaks of nature. The encrusting properties of the calcareous waters of one of the affluents of the Lycus, and the enormous mass of hot water which falls in a cascade from the mountains of Hierapolis, have struck the plain with sterility, and formed crevasses, quaint caverns, beds of subterranean streams, fantastic piles and layers like petrified snow, serving as a reservoir for waters which reflect all the colours of the rainbow; deep hollows, whence far-resounding waters rush on in a succession of cataracts. On this side the heat is extreme, the soil being nothing but one vast plain, paved with calcareous blocks. But, upon the heights of Hierapolis, the purity of the air, the splendid light, the view of Mount Cadmus, swimming like another Olympus in a lustrous atmosphere, the burnt-up summits of Phrygia fading into the blue of heaven in a rosy tint, the opening of the valley of the Meander, the oblique outlines of Messogis, the far white summits of Tmolus, produce a truly dazzling effect. There lived St. Philip and Papias: there Epictetus was born. All the valley of the Lycus presents the same character of dreamy mysticism. The population was not Greek by origin; it was partly Phrygian. There was also, it would seem, round Mount Cadmus, an old Semitic settlement.

"This peaceable valley, separated from the rest of the world, became a sort of asylum for Christianity. Christian thought was subjected there to serious trials. The evangelist of these regions was Epaphroditus, or Epaphras, of Co-

[1] Strabo, xii. 8. 16; xiii. 4. 14.

[2] The *Tchoruk-Sou* of the Turks.

[3] For the ancient importance of Colosse, see Xenophon, *Anabas*. i. 2. 6 (εἰς Κολοσσάς, πόλιν οἰκουμένην εὐδαίμονα καὶ μεγάλην)—πόλιν μεγάλην Herod. vii. 20; also Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 3. 41. A misapprehension of the last passage is obviated by Bp. Lightfoot, p. 16, note [1]. Strabo also speaks of it as πόλισμα (xii. 17). The ruins of Colosse are those of a very secondary place. The theatre is poor. Probably the town was never fully restored after the earthquake of A.D. 60 (Tacit. *Annal.* xiv. 27). The site of Chone must have seemed much more agreeable. The ruins of Laodicea and Hierapolis are of the first order, truly grand and beautiful.

Digitized by Google

losse, a very zealous Christian, the friend and fellow-labourer of St. Paul (Coloss. i. 6, 7; iv. 12, 13). The Apostle had done nothing more than merely pass by the valley of the Lycus; he never returned to it (ii. 1). But these Churches, mainly composed of converted Pagans, were, notwithstanding, completely dependent upon him (i. 9; ii. 1, 13). Epaphras exercised a sort of episcopate over the three cities (iv. 13). We read of Nymphodorus, or Nymphas, who at Laodicea had a church meeting in his house; the rich and liberal Philemon, who presided at Colosse over an assemblage of the same kind; Apphia,[1] a deaconess of that town, possibly Philemon's wife;[2] Archippus, who also filled an important function, recognising Paul as his chief (Coloss. iv. 15; Philemon vv. 1, 2, 5, 7). The last-named seems to have worked directly with St. Paul; the Apostle speaks of him as his 'companion in arms.'[3]

"It is to be observed that *Judaism* preceded Christianity in these regions. Jewish colonies had been transplanted from Babylon two centuries and a half before, and had first brought with them some of those industries (carpet-weaving, for instance)[4] which, under the Roman emperors, produced in the country such opulence, and such powerful guilds or companies.——Phrygia became from henceforth, and remained for three hundred years, a country which was essentially Christian. A great number of the Christians of Ephesus and of Rome came from Phrygia. The names most frequently found upon the Phrygian monuments are the old Christian names, the names of the Apostolic age, those which fill the martyrologies.[1]——The country differs a good deal from the rest of Asia. It is sombre and melancholy, bearing a deep impress of old geological catastrophes, burnt up, or rather *incinerated*, and agitated by frequent earthquakes."[2]

2. Allusions of a local and temporary character are not frequent in the Epistle to the Colossians, as we have already observed. Yet a few may be noted. (a) The μετέστησεν ("translated") of chapter i. 13, may well be allusive to a fact of importance in the history of Phrygia. The gentle "translation" by God of redeemed souls into His kingdom may be a reference which would be peculiarly recognised by those who had so often heard of the rough and barbarous "translation" by Antiochus into Lydia and Phrygia. (See Additional Note on i. 13.) (b) The "not being moved away" (μὴ μετακινούμενοι, i. 23) is probably in allusion to an innovating spirit, to change and turbulence in social or political life.[3] Now Colosse, as distinguished from its neighbours of Laodicea and Hierapolis, evidently retained and suffered from its *conservatism*. Its remains lead modern travellers to observe that it did not throw itself into the new life offered to Phrygia by the Roman empire, and zealously accepted by Laodicea and Hierapolis. The very sepulture of the dead bore witness to the spell exercised over the Colossian mind by the ideas of antiquity, and to

[1] Philemon 2.

[2] St. Chrysost. and Theodoret so understand it.

[3] συνστρατιώτης. Philemon 2. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 3.

[4] The country round Laodicea was covered with sheep, with a peculiar rich black fleece (κοραξός, *raven-black*). The water at Hierapolis was much valued by dyers for some chemical qualities. Colosse gave its name to a purple dye ("a vepribus nascitur cyclaminum—flos ejus *Colossinus* in coronas adnectitur," Plin. N. H. xxi. 9. § 27). "Is there," asks Bp. Lightfoot, "any allusion to this branch of trade in the message to the Church of Laodicea, Rev. iii. 17, 18?" (γυμνός . . . ἱμάτια λευκά). He also suggests a possible allusion to the βάμμα Σαρδιανικόν and the φοινικίδες Σαρδιανικαί in the message to the Church of Sardis, Apoc. iii. 5 (Bp. Lightfoot, *Ep. to Coloss.* p. 22, note [4]).

[1] Trophimus, Tychicus, Tryphena, Telesphorus, Papias, Onesimus. These names are common to all Western Asia. Cf. *Inscrip. G.* 2788, 3664, 3749, &c.; Wagener, *Inscrip. d'Asie Min.* p. 19; Waddington, *Voy. Num.* pp. 55–134. [See other authorities in Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 364, note [1].]

[2] Renan, *Saint Paul*, pp. 356–365. [Cf. throughout Reithmayer, Introd. Can. S. de N. T. (Fr. translat.), p. 281; Bülmer, *Isagog. in Ep. ad Coloss.* pp. 1 *seqq.*; Strabo, *Geograph.* cap. xii. 8–13.]

[3] For the political reference of the word, cf. Xenoph. *de Rep. Laced.* xv. 1; Esd. ix. 11, LXX. Bretschneider (who says that the word is used "de perturbatione reipublicæ,") adds another instance from Josephus—μετακινηθέντος τοῦ κόσμου τῆς πολιτείας, *Antiq.* v. 3, 2.

Digitized by Google

the immobility with which it lingered in a world that had passed away. Only one necropolis has been discovered by travellers. And M. Renan specially adverts to the antique and "almost Semitic" character of its monuments. (c) Unless we have misapprehended the meaning of the passage in which St. Paul gives directions to the Colossian Church upon the subject of singing in worship (ἐν χάριτι ᾄδοντες, iii. 16, see Notes), there is a special hint at the Phrygian music, quite of a piece with the references to *citizenship* in the Epistle to the Philippians, and the allusion to ***building*** in that to the Ephesians.

## III.

1. But if other local and temporary topics occupy little space in the Epistle to the Colossians, it is not so with a philosophical and religious movement, which began to show itself at the time with a vigorous development. This movement has been called the "Phrygian heresy." The phrase has, probably, the same measure of truth as that once in fashion among theologians, who enumerated Mahommedanism or the Turkish heresy, among Christian heresies. The name of Christ was not discarded by these Phrygians, nor a certain Divine mission denied to Him with ceremonious expressions of honour; but that was all. In reference to this form of error in Phrygia, the Epistle to the Colossians is crossed and re-crossed with iron dogmatic girders. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that almost every verse of the Epistle—except the very few which are of a personal character—is compacted into, and tells upon, the metallic density of this argumentative structure. For the two great characteristics of this singular Phrygian movement issued in two grand mistakes, which traversed the whole texture of thought and practice, speculation and action, principle and life. *Speculatively*, the reception of this vast network of angelic and subordinate mediations was a rejection of the Incarnation. It was said by an acute observer of men, who looked at all forms of Christianity with the impartiality of one who occupied an external position,[1] that in the religion of France in the early part of the last century, "Christ indeed presided as King, but was a good deal hidden behind a crowd of courtiers" (saints and angels). But, in the Phrygian system, Christ was absolutely dethroned, and with many expressions of respect, relegated to a place among

> Thrones, dominations, princedoms, virtues, powers.

A shadowy phantastic transcendental idealism, and a mystical approach to God through angels and æons, were substituted for the very Man, the real Cross, the actual death, the true redemption which consists in forgiveness of sin.[2] But this theoretical error was accompanied by, and at root was the cause of, a grave practical mistake—a mistake pervading the entire life of those who received it. A series of minute observances, of petty devotions, of fragmentary rules and little ascetic efforts—the small ritualisms and smaller practical code of Judaizing superstition—were exchanged for the breadth and strength of the Christian's supernatural life, begun in Baptism—for a real union with the Risen and Ascended Lord.[3]

2. The style of St. Paul in the present letter is influenced through and through by this important subject. His want of personal acquaintance with the Colossian Christians, generally restrains the almost passionate flow of affectionate words so common with him elsewhere. The language is pressed and serried, strong and brief. For the reader who studies it with the true key in his possession, there is scarcely one superfluous word—one which does not tell upon the writer's main purpose.

With a perception of St. Paul's object, and a consideration of the peculiarity of style necessarily resulting from it,

[1] St. Évremond.

[2] Cf. those verses whose "mode of expression only seems strange until we have observed the reason of it," i. 22, 14; ii. 14, 15.

[3] ii. 20, 23; iii. 1, 12. The old dispensation manifestly afforded an excuse for making much of angels. Galat. iii. 19; Hebrews ii. 2. For a lively idea of the way in which Manichean Gnosticism may have adapted its angelology to Judaizing views, see St. Augustine, *Confessions*, x. 67.

Digitized by Google

nearly all objections to the genuineness of the letter fall to the ground of themselves.

For the *objections* to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Colossians may be arranged under three heads:

I. Of *Doctrine*.
II. Of *Style*.
III. Of *Imitation*.

### I. Of Doctrine.

A. An exaggerated Christology.

Language is said to be used about our Lord as prototype and author of Creation (i. 15), which is beyond any employed in unquestionably Pauline Epistles, and which is in the tone of writings attributed to St. John.

B. A minimized view of Faith and Justification.

C. A substitution of moral and metaphysical formulæ ("love," "knowledge") for "faith and works" which came so prominently to the front in early times.

D. Angelology developed (i. 16, ii. 10).

E. A Gnostic tinge (i. 19, ii. 9).

F. Redemption exaggerated (i. 20).

### II. Of Style and Language.

A. Peculiar use of πλήρωμα (i. 19, ii. 9).

B. The phrase τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ (iii. 24).

C. φανερώθῃ . . . φανερωθήσεσθε (iii. 4) for 'the *Parousia*.'

D. Curiously compounded words (πιθανολογία, ii. 4; ἐθελοθρησκεία, ii. 23; ὀφθαλμοδουλείαι, iii. 22).

E. Syntactical.—A sparing employment of particles—a taste for looping on members of a phrase, interlaced by relative pronouns or participial nexus.

F. Rhetorical. — The style is pronounced to be more emphatic and rounded, with less of spring and naturalness, declamatory and overloaded.

### III. Of Imitations.

These are mainly of the Epistle to the Ephesians.[1]

| Colossians. | Ephesians. |
|---|---|
| I. 13, 22. | II. |
| II. 12, 14. | |
| I. 25, 28. | III. 1–12. |
| II. 2, 3. | III. 18, 19. |
| II. 9, 10. | III. 19; IV. 13. |
| III. 12, 13. | IV. 2. |
| III. 14. | IV. 3, 16. |
| III. 18, 21. | V. 21, 26. |

Without entering into all details, the more important of their objections almost refute themselves.

For the leading doctrinal objection—an exaggerated Christology.

Surely the most energetic expressions of the Epistle to the Colossians are not really in advance of the glory attributed to Christ in earlier Epistles, at once "uncontested and incontestable." We shall see that the most magnificent Christological passages in Colossians are not in substance beyond the titles in the (so-called) "undogmatic Epistles" to the Thessalonians.[1]

The presence of words and phrases with a "Gnostic tinge"[2] is accounted for in two ways: (1) a portion of these terms came into the common stock of Christian language from the lips of Christ Himself (see Note *infra* on Col. i. 12, 13, and Introd. to 1 St. John); (2) the Apostle loved, like all great Christian teachers, to take up words and ideas valued by opponents, and to use them in their true and highest signification.

The absence of thoughts and of aspects of truth prominently brought forward in one Epistle, or class of Epistles, is no objection to those who consider the breadth of Christian Theology and the different types of error, with which it was confronted.

In the concise and energetic style of Colossians lies the best refutation of its supposed imitativeness. No sustained and pointedly expressed argumentative composition can possibly be a cento of quotations. But the Epistles to the

[1] Also

| | |
|---|---|
| Coloss. ii. 5. | 1 Cor. v. 3. |
| ,, iii. 10. | Galat. iii. 28. |

It should be noted that several references to the Epist. to Ephes. are also made by St. Peter:

| 1 St. Peter. | Ephesians. |
|---|---|
| I. 1, 2, 3. | I. 3, 4, 7. |
| II. 18. | VI. 5. |
| III. 1. | V. 22, sqq. |
| III. 22. | I. 20, sqq. |
| V. 5. | V. 21. |

[1] Well may M. Renan exclaim that "in such passages (1 Cor. ii. 8; viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 18, 21; Romans ix. 5) the most exaggerated *formula* of 'Consubstantiality' are felt by anticipation!" (*Saint Paul*, p. 274.)

[2] That there are no real vestiges of a Gnostic bias in the writer of the Ep. to Coloss. has been proved by H. G. Meyer, *Comm.* p. 160; Roediger, *de Christolog. Paulinâ*, ii. 42.

Digitized by Google

Ephesians and the Colossians were almost contemporaneous. A man like St Paul writing two long Epistles about the same time with certain leading ideas prominently before him, would be sure to fall into some favourite expressions.

While these, and several other general features, are utterly inconsistent with the notion of the Epistle to the Colossians being a forgery, great weight must always be laid upon its connexion with the Epistle to Philemon. If Colossians is a forgery, then most assuredly Philemon is a forgery also. But that leaflet is so sincere, so impressed with an intense and inimitable reality, so much beyond the very level of the feelings of the Church itself for centuries, that it *must* have been written by St. Paul.

3. The Epistle to the Colossians may be analysed as follows:—

After the Salutation and Preface, it falls into two portions—of which the first is *dogmatic;* the last *application*, *polemical*, and *practical.*

i.

The dogmatic[1] portion of the Epistle—Salutation (i. 1, 2).

A. Transition to the dogmatic portion—

(a) prayer and thanksgiving for them (vers. 2, 5);

(b) reminder of two great notes of the Gospel, as they originally received it—*fecundity and Catholicity* (vers. 5, 8);

(c) Epaphras had brought good tidings of the condition of the Colossian Church—hence, increased prayer for increased gifts (vers. 9, 11).

1. Reminder what they had and have from God in Christ.

(a) deliverance.

(b) translation—with incorporation into the Kingdom.

(c) redemption (vers. 12, 15).

2. Reminder what Christ is in Himself—the dogmatic portion proper (i. 15—ii. 4).

(a) The Image (v. 15).

(b) The First-born of Creation (v. 15)—what this involves (vers. 16, 17).

(c) The Head of the Church (v. 18).

(d) Beginning (*ibid.*).

(e) First-born from the dead (*ibid.*).

*Therefore*, First in all (v. 18);

because it was God's pleasure that in Him all the *pleroma* should dwell in bodily wise (v. 19).

*Therefore*, as result:

3. (a) universal ideal reconciliation (v. 20).

(b) *their* reconciliation by His very death, in His very Person, to be their Presenter to God (vers. 21, 22).

But these results are conditional upon their steadfastness—not allowing themselves to be isolated by local error into a partial and fragmentary schism from that which is the Gospel—*Pauline and Apostolic* (οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος —ἀπόστολος—v. 23).

[Transition from dogma to application.

(a) Personal joy in suffering for the Church (v. 24).

(b) His charge of fully declaring the mystery (vers. 25–27).

with its message to be brought home to every single heart (vers. 25–29).

This declaration is a strife and struggle, even for them and others whom he had never seen (v. 29; ii. 1).

But no price is too high to pay for his purpose, viz. that in their heart of hearts they may have the deep-felt knowledge of the mystery (v. 2);

for that mystery is *Christ.* All that Gnostic mystics and theosophists boast is in Him (v. 3).]

II.

Application of the dogmatic portion of the Epistle.

i.

Polemical application (ii. 4—iii. 1).

A.

*Preface.*—This dogmatic teaching is to guard them against sophistry (v. 4).

Far away as he is, he sees and rejoices in their order and fixed faith (v. 5).

Let them continue and advance (vers. 6, 7).

B.

*Direct polemical application.*

Let them beware of those who would make *them* their spoil, by a philosophy which is also a hollow deception.

This philosophy has five deficiencies. It is (1) *traditional;* (2) *human;* (3) *elementary;* (4) *material*—therefore (5) *unchristian* (v. 8).

Dogma of the Incarnation stated (v. 9).

Christians complete in Him, who is the completedness (v. 10).

They need no circumcision, having in Baptism a circumcision, (1) *internal;* (2) *universal;* (3) of which *Christ* is the author (vers. 10, 11).

The sign of circumcision has passed into the sacrament of Baptism. We have the deadness of the spiritual uncircumcision quickened into life with Christ — forgiveness — emancipation from a yoke of ordinances—Christ's victory the pledge of ours (vers. 12–16).

[1] The terms *dogmatic*, *doctrinal*, *polemical*, are used confusedly, almost promiscuously, by many recent writers. A *dogma* is the formal statement, in precise and definite language, of a positive *theological* truth. But *theology* in the sense of the earlier church is peculiarly connected with the Person and Divinity of Christ. Hence *dogmatic* is just the attribute to be predicated of such precise and formal statements as occur in Colossians i. 14, 18. *Doctrine* is teaching fairly *deducible* from *dogma*, and is better applied to the more subjective aspects of religion. The Incarnation of Christ is a *dogma;* justification by faith is a *doctrine.* The term *polemical* indicates the application of a dogma or a doctrine in controversy.

Digitized by Google

Conclusion:

1. Do not let them submit even to be *judged* as to things ritual—Judaizing ceremonialism and the like (v. 16);

because they are mere *shadows* (v. 17).

2. Still less let them submit to orientalizing Gnostic philosophy—with its *cultus* of angels (v. 18)—whose characteristics are (a) a humility tainted by self-will; (b) an inflated and carnal arrogance; (c) a profession of towering transcendentalism; (d) an affectation of knowledge of the unknowable—culminating (e) in miserable self-isolation from the one true living Head, from Whom the whole body has its vital principle, structure, and growth (vers. 18, 19).

Why should they go on, as if their Baptism were not? holding a false *principle* of spiritual life—therefore miserably wrong in its *details*; mistaking shadowy ordinances for grace-giving realities, imaginary spiritual beings for the actual Christ, petty rules for the well-spring of the supernatural life (vers. 18–23).

ii.

Dogmatic portion of the Epistle applied *practically*.

A. General principle of the supernatural life (iii. 1–18).

Christ our Life—the great principle of a new human life is union with our Risen and Ascended Lord—to be manifested further (vers. 1–4);

therefore, mortify each limb of the great body of sin—mainly, sins of lust (vers. 5–8).

Not only these, but others of another kind; for they have a new nature, a new creation, in a new world—where Christ's influence is felt from the centre round the whole circumference (vers. 8–11).

Cultivate tender human emotions, especially love (vers. 12–14); let Christ's peace rule in their hearts (v. 15); let the inward beauty of His word find sweet and graceful expression in varied *Church-song*[1] (v. 16).

Aim at perpetual union with Christ, and at making life one unbroken thanksgiving (v. 17).

B.

*Details of duty.*

Wives and husbands (vers. 18, 19).

Children and fathers (vers. 20–21).

Slaves and masters (v. 22–iv. 2).

Prayer generally—for him (vers. 2–5).

Wise speech—eager purchase by Christ's merchants of each golden opportunity (vers. 5–6).

Tychicus and Onesimus (vers. 7–9).

Salutations to the Colossian Church,

(a) from his helpers of the Circumcision (vers. 10, 11);

(b) from Epaphras, who had such a peculiar interest in them, in Laodicea, and in Hierapolis (vers. 12, 13);

(c) from Luke and Demas (ver. 14).

Salutation to Laodicea (ver. 15).

[1] A reference to the notes on iii. 16, 17, will shew that this is, probably, the precise idea—not merely "Christian conversation and meditation, assisted by Divine poetry and music."

Letters to Laodicea and Colosse to be mutually read (ver. 16).

Message of warning to Archippus (ver. 17).

Salutation and last words (ver. 18).

## IV.

The external testimony to the Epistle to the Colossians is considerable.

The following verses are quoted or referred to in the Apostolic Fathers.

| | |
|---|---|
| Coloss. i. 16. | Barnab. Epist. xii. |
| ,, 18. | 1 Clem. ad Corinth. xxiv. (with 1 Corinth. xv. 20.) |
| ,, 25. | Ignat. ad Ephes. x. |
| ,, iii. 4. | Ibid. iii. |
| ,, 14. | 1 Clem. ad Corinth. xlix. |

Marcion, the earliest herald of sceptical criticism, who rejected the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, admitted Colossians and Philemon into his collection. It is cited by Irenæus,[1] Clement of Alexandria,[2] Tertullian,[3] and still earlier by Theophilus of Antioch[4] and Justin Martyr.[5]

All candid criticism agrees with M. Renan's conclusion that the Epistle to the Colossians is "to be received unhesitatingly as the work of St. Paul" (*Saint Paul*, Introd. p. ix.).

[1] Adv. *Hæreses*, V. xiv. 2 (quotes Coloss. i. 21); *ibid.* III. xiv. 1 (quotes Coloss. iv. 14).

[2] ὡσαύτως ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ἐπιστρέφουσι Κολοσσαεῦσί (φησι) βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς, κ. τ. λ. Coloss. ii. 8. *Strom.* vi. 8. Cf. *Strom.* v. 10 for Coloss. i. 9.

[3] Tertull. *c. Marc.* v. 19.

[4] τοῦτον τὸν Λόγον ἐγέννησεν ὁ Θεὸς προφορικὸν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως.—*Ad Autol.* ii. 22 (Coloss. i. 15). Theophilus also quotes τὰ ἄνω φρονοῦντες (Coloss. iii. 2). *Ad Autol.* ii. 17 (p. 84, edit. J. J. Humphrey).

[5] *Dialog. c. Tryphon.* lxxxiv. lxxxv., where Coloss. i. 15, 17, are quoted. Cf. also περιτεμνόμεθα δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ X. διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ἐκδυόμενοι τὸν Ἀδάμ . . . καὶ ἐνδυόμενοι τὸν X. δι' ὃν δικαιωθέντες ἀνιστάμεθα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἐν ᾧ, φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, περιετμήθητε περιτομὴν ἀχειροποίητον κ.τ.λ. (Coloss. ii. 11). *Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthod.* quæst. 102.—Justin M. also, in his sketch of a Christian life, says of him who would guide his course aright, in the communion of the Church (τὸν ὀρθῶς πολιτευόμενον) that he must take his part in praise (ὕμνους τε καὶ ψαλμοὺς καὶ ᾠδὰς καὶ αἶνον ῥητέον) referring to Coloss. iii. 16 (Epist. ad Zenam et Serenum, 9). Colossians i. 16 is in his mind in *Cohort. ad Gent.* xv. 23 (see note in Otto, S. Justin. M. *Opp.* ii. 60). Cf. *Epist. ad Diognet.* vii. 8, 9. The words ποιητὴν καὶ δημιουργὸν τῆς πάσης κτίσεως, ὁρατῆς τε καὶ ἀοράτου, κ.τ.λ. (*Acta Mart. S. Justin.* ii. 9, 10), point to the same passage.

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# COLOSSIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *After salutation he thanketh God for their faith,* 7 *confirmeth the doctrine of Epaphras,* 9 *prayeth further for their increase in grace,* 14 *describeth the true Christ,* 21 *encourageth them to receive Jesus Christ, and commendeth his own ministry.*

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timotheus *our* brother.

2 To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

3 We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you,

4 Since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love *which ye have* to all the saints,

5 For the hope which is laid up for

---

1. **Apostle.**] This title is not used in all the Epistles—for instance, not in Philipp. i. 1. He writes now in virtue of an apostolic commission.

*of Christ Jesus by* **will of God.**] "Of Christ Jesus" scarcely includes a polemical reference, as if the Apostle were hinting in an undertone, and we were to read between the lines "*not of angels*" (Theophylact, Chrysost.). It seems to follow necessarily as an explanation and enlargement of "Apostle." But "by will of God" may include a reference to false Apostles in their self-will.

*and Timothy* **the brother.**] Timothy is mentioned simply and without addition in the title of Philipp. "Timothy the brother" occurs, precisely as here, in the salutation of the Ep. to Philemon. We have here one indication that the three Epistles are of the same date.

2. *To the* **brethren in Colosse** (see Note at end of Chapter), **holy and faithful in Christ.**] The force of the original might best be given, if we were able to say in English, "to the in Colosse consecrated and faithful brothers in Christ." The description refers to two different spheres (1) *local,* from the place in which their lot is cast; (2) *moral* and *spiritual.* They have union with each other as a fraternity having two conditions (a) union with God ("holy"), (b) union with the Church's creed ("faithful"), and all this in a world where Christ is all in all—(On the mystical force of ἐν, see on 1 St. John ii. 6). See additional note on v. 2.

3, 4. *We give thanks* . . . **while we pray.** . . . *since we heard.* (See Winer, iii. § xlv. 3, P. 361.) Though he had not *seen* them, he bestows upon them the fulness of Apostolic love and Apostolic intercession (Chrysost.). St. Paul had not "direct personal knowledge of the Colossian Church." (Bp. Lightfoot, P. 133, cf. Introd. P. 27.) But this conclusion could not be drawn from these words *alone,* for St. Paul uses the same expression ('having heard of your faith') in writing to the Church of Ephesus, where he had laboured three years, Eph. i. 15.

4, 5. It is preferable not to join "for the hope" with "we give thanks"—"we give thanks for the hope" (as Beng.)—but to link faith and charity to hope. "Since we heard of the faith in Christ Jesus, and the love to all the saints which ye **hold fast** for the hope's sake." (On the pregnant sense of "*have,*" in St. Paul and St. John, see on 1 St. John i. 8.)

*laid up.*] Reserved, set apart, (of the *Mina* laid up in the napkin, St. Luke xix. 20), with dat. of the person for whom. Used of a "crown" (2 Tim. iv. 8), of death (Heb. ix. 27; cf. 4 Macc. viii. 19).

*whereof ye heard before.*] 'Which was part of your *first* Gospel-teaching, the *first*

Digitized by Google

you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel;

6 Which is come unto you, as *it is* in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as *it doth* also in you, since the day ye heard *of it*, and knew the grace of God in truth:

---

pure lesson ye learned in better days, before teachers came with later refinements, which were rather corruptions.' Or, with a different interpretation of προ, a subtler rendering has been given—"The hope of which you, and all of us, hear in the Gospel before it comes and is turned into fruition—the salvation hoped for before its arrival" (Grimm, *Lex. N. T.* s. v.).

*in the word of the truth of the gospel.*] With implied opposition to a false Gospel, by which they were in danger of being deceived.

**6. Which is come in presence unto you, as it is also in all the world; yea, and it is continually bringing forth fruit and making increase unto itself, as it doth also in you** (see Note at end of Chapter).

*Which is come in presence.*] Τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς. "He speaks of the Gospel as of a living and animated thing. For it did not first come to you and leave you, but remained and is now present," (Chrysost., Theophyl.). πάρειμι is almost universally used of *persons* (see Note at end of Chapter).

*as it is* (καθὼς καί, sub. πάρεστι) *come in all the world.*] Something is here to be allowed for the glow and elevation of language (as *infra*, v. 23). Yet, according to Christ's command, the Gospel had already been widely preached (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). St. Paul feels intensely that the leaven from the stores of the Nazarene Householder is leavening the whole lump of humanity; that the seed of the word is being wafted everywhere. For indications that this feeling was habitual with him, see Rom. x. 18; xv. 23; 2 Cor. x. 14, &c. It is interesting to observe this early appreciation of the note of *Catholicity*.—The Catholicity of the Gospel was a topic of confirmation. "We are so constituted as to be confirmed by having many sharers in our faith" (Chrysost.). It would encourage the Colossians to reflect that they were labouring under no local delusion, and need suspect the contagion of no local fanaticism.

Bp. Lightfoot well remarks how the true Gospel proclaims its *truth* by its *universality*. False gospels are local and special. Heresies are provincial or national; truth is catholic. The same thought in another form underlies iii. 11, with a more special reference to the arrogance of Jews and Judaism.

It has been observed that the universality of the Gospel may also be contrasted here by implication with the secret doctrines of Gnostic speculation which were for the initiated few.

*Yea, and it is continually bringing forth fruit for itself.*] See note *infra* for the reading. St. Paul states that the Gospel is a fertile tree in the world, yielding fruit abundantly, of which the Colossians also gave abundant specimens. This thought is of special weight, and needs emphatic affirmation. Hence, he does not continue the sentence in the form which we might expect, but exchanges καὶ καρποφορεῖ, for καὶ ἔστιν καρποφορούμενον, as an assertion that it is a tree whose natural and necessary tendency is to create fruit to itself (Reiche). The Middle here "refers back the action to the agent *mediately*, in as far as the action is done *to*, or in any way *for*, the agent." Winer, iii. § xxxviii. P. 268. "Semen spargo *mihi*," Bretschn. The verb καρποφορῶ seems to be caught from the lips of Christ in the Parable of the Sower (St. Matt. xiii. 23; St. Mark iv. 20 (v. 28); St. Luke viii. 15. It is used outside the Gospels by St. Paul alone—and by him only in this Epistle—except in Rom. vii. 4, 5.

*and making increase unto itself.*] External and internal reasons are alike in favour of retaining these words, omitted in A.V. "Making increase" seems, at first sight, out of place, *after* "bringing forth fruit." The tree must *grow* before it is *fruitful*. But while growth is, of course, specially predicated of trees and plants (St. Matt. xiii. 32), the Apostle probably drops the figure which he has employed, and simply goes on to speak of Gospel growth. (A pedantically accurate use of figurative language is not always aimed at by St. Paul; cf. Rom. xii. 23.) In Acts, the word is frequently, and almost technically, used, to express this. (Acts vi. 7; xv. 24, xix. 20). "Bringing forth fruit" would then denote the production of spiritual graces, dispositions, and virtues; while the "increase" would signify the external propagation of the Gospel, the addition of new converts and new churches. (The different shade of thought expressed by the same word in a different context, inf. v. 10, ("increasing in knowledge") is no objection to this view.)

These "notes" of *fecundity* and *expansion* still characterise the Church. We turn, now to the one fruit of holiness, alike in every climate and under all conditions; now to the

Digitized by Google

7 As ye also learned of Epaphras our dear fellowservant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ;

8 Who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit.

9 For this cause we also, since the day we heard *it*, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding;

10 That ye might walk worthy of

---

work going on in the mission-field. No effete system ever won such various adherents. No dying tree ever produced such fruit.

*Ye* **heard and thoroughly** *knew the* **grace of God.**] The "of it" in the A.V. is to be carefully avoided. "*Grace*" is the accus. after the two verbs, "heard" and "knew." (See Note at end of Chapter.)

*in truth.*] *Verè*, truly. Heb. באמת.

**7.** *Even as ye learned* **it** *from Epaphras.* On Epaphras, see *infra*, IV. 12] Philemon, v. 23. Cf. the terms applied to Tychicus: *inf.* iv. 7.

*for you.*] Rather, on **our behalf**, "as representing *us*."

**8.** *our delegate to you, yours also to us, who brought us the news of your love, as you feel and show it moving ever in the circle of the influence of the Spirit.*

**9.** *that ye might be filled with the* **perfect knowledge** (τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν) *of His will.*] All the four Epistles of the Captivity pray for this. (Eph. i. 17; Philipp. i. 9; Coloss. i. 9, 10, ii. 2, iii. 10; Philemon i. 6.) Possibly, when a thoroughly spiritual soul is turned in upon itself, and excluded from external activity, even the speculative beauty of truth is seen more fully, and the glory and importance of "knowledge" is more fully realised. Still, the 'perfect knowledge' of which St. Paul here speaks is chastened and restrained by a practical limit, which saves it from finding no 'end in wandering mazes lost.' That limit is supplied by the words "of His *will*." (The 119th Psalm was not improbably written by a confessor in a dungeon, and is pervaded by a similar love of God's law, and sense of its exceeding breadth and the blessedness of knowing it. See vv. 96, 97.) There may also, in this *epignosis*, be a reference to the false *gnosis* of the Gnostic teachers. Bishop Wordsworth cites 2 St. Peter i. 2, 3, 8; ii. 20.

**in all wisdom and understanding spiritual.**] The attribute *spiritual* extends to both. Wisdom (σοφία) is, according to Aristotle, not only to know the *results* of first principles (τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῶν), but to have a true grasp of the *principles themselves* (περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀληθεύειν). While wisdom is thus primary, the mistress of all sciences (ἡ ἀκριβεστάτη τῶν ἐπιστημῶν, Ethic. Nicom. vi. 7), understanding (σύνεσις) is particular and concerned with details. The first is creative, the second critical. Of the higher sense of σοφία, such as we find it in Wisdom and Proverbs, there is no question here. So far as there is a distinction between the two words, wisdom is generally the knowledge of spiritual mysteries, of great theological principles; understanding is the faculty of applying them to action. "Both in *understanding* the mysteries of Christianity, and in *ordering your lives* according thereto." (Hammond, *in loc.*)

**10.** *That ye might walk worthy of the Lord.*] *I.e.* worthily of *Christ*, as becomes faithful *Christians*. For the expression, cf. "worthily of calling," Ephes. iv.; of "saints," Rom. xvi. 2; of "gospel," Phil. 1, 27; of "God," 1 Thess. ii. 12; 3 St. John v. 6.

*unto all pleasing.*] Not exactly of *God*, but of *Christ*, who has just been spoken of in "worthily of the *Lord*." The word "pleasing" (ἀρέσκεια) had originally a slightly unfavourable tinge about it, an implication of obsequious courtliness or flattery. The verb is once used by St. Paul in a good sense (1 Cor. x. 33; cf. compound in Titus ii. 9), but it is also used in a bad sense of unworthy flattery of men (1 Thess. ii. 4; also the compound ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, "manpleaser," inf. iii. 22). In Philo it is rather frequently applied to studious desire to please God. (See passages in Bretsch. Lex. Man. s. v.) In the higher signification to which it is raised in religion, the idea of careful homage as to a king whom we wish to please is probably preserved. "That we should make our one life-walk worthily of Christ our King, to whom we pay a court, which can never be extravagant or degenerate into flattery, that we may please Him."

**growing up towards the perfect knowledge of God.**] We adopt here the T. R. (αὐξανόμενον εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν). The great authority of Bishop Lightfoot is for a different reading and interpretation, viz. τῇ ἐπιγνώσει—the "simple instrumental dative" —growth by knowledge. (So also Huther; de Wette.) Would it not rather be ἐν in this sense? (1 Peter ii. 2.) The verb is construed with εἰς, Ephes. iv. 15, 21; 1 Peter ii. 2, and this gives the best meaning. At the same time, the greatest amount of external authority is for the reading which signifies "growing by the perfect knowledge of God."

Digitized by Google

the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God;

11 Strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and longsuffering with joyfulness;

12 Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light:

13 Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated *us* into the kingdom of ¶his dear Son:

¶ Gr. *the Son of his love.*

14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins:

15 Who is the image of the in-

---

**11.** *patience and long-suffering.*] *Patience* is in respect of *persons*, *long-suffering* in respect of *things*. Long-suffering may be applied to God, for He bears with *men;* but from *things* there can be no burden upon Him, and therefore no patience. (Archbp. Trench, Syn. N. T., P. 189.) "The sphere of the exercise of patience lies, now in contempt of worldly goods, now in bravely and thankfully enduring affliction, mainly in constancy of faith and charity; so that neither by the temptation of worldly goods, nor by pressure of affliction, will it allow itself to be shaken or hindered from its proper work" (Cocceius on St. James i. 12).

**12.** *Who hath made us meet for* **the assigned portion** *of the lot of* **the saints which is in the light.**] (εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου.) The *apposition* here is annexed in genitive governed by the principal noun itself. (Winer, Pt. iii. § lix. P. 553. 'The share consisting in the lot,' "The parcel of the lot."—Bp. Lightfoot.)

*The* **portion of the lot.**] An allusion either (1) to the *division* of the Promised Land by *lot* in the doomsday-book of Canaan (Joshua xv. 1, sqq. "With reference to this, the Apostle calls the heavenly inheritance the *lot* of the saints," Bp. Davenant in loc., so also Pelag. ap. S. Hieron. Opp. xi. 893); or (2) more probably to the ancient custom of dividing the inheritance by lot, "*sors hæreditatis.*" (Isaiah xvii. 11; LXX.) It would be utterly mistaken here to interpret St. Paul as attributing arbitrary and gratuitous action to God; his object is simply to bring out our unworthiness. The *lot* does not follow the order of *deserving*, but its falling is ruled by that inexplicable combination which we call fortune or chance; and our *lot* in the heavenly kingdom is not of our merit, but of something, higher indeed than chance, yet equally removed from our power of influence, viz. God's grace. (This is important in interpreting ἐν ᾧ ἐκληρώθημεν, Ephes. i. 11; see note there.) There is simply no ground of antecedent worthiness in us. ("It is called *lot* to show that it is not won by our *worth.*") (Chrysost.)

*the lot of the saints which lieth in the light.*] (Well rendered by Dank, "Quo auctore facti sunt participes sortis *sanctorum quæ sita est in lumine.*" Hist. Rev. Div. ii. 445.) The lot of their inheritance lies in the glorious region of the light. Light is the perfect ideal of holiness, beauty, and joy (Apoc. xxi. 23). To be partakers in the lot of the saints in the light is to be partakers of their holiness and felicity.

**13.** *Who* **delivered** *us from the power of* **the** *darkness, and* **translated** *us into the kingdom of the* **Son of His love.**] "Delivered us" by one great victorious act as a conqueror (on ῥύομαι, see 1 Thessal. i. 10); "translated us" by a wholesale transplantation and incorporation "into the kingdom of the Son of His love," the kingdom of Christ, the Church here and now (probably with a polemical undertone—the kingdom of His dear *Son*, not of *angels*). ("We are under the *Heir*, not under *servants.*" Severian, quoted by Bp. Lightfoot; cf. Hebrews i. 2, ii. 5.) We are not simply *delivered;* our deliverance is also a *transference.* (See Note at end of Chapter.)

*from the power of* **the** *darkness.*] "The power" (τῆς ἐξουσίας). The word often means authority, rightful power—yet frequently has an implicit notion of acting as one wills, irrespective of justice and mercy. St. Paul evidently signifies a transference from tyrannical sway to a gently ordered and constitutional kingdom. "Simply to be under Satan is hard. But with this power which is tyranny added, it is harder far." (Chrysost.)

**the** *darkness.*] Our Lord's very words have here passed into the language of St. Paul (ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους, S. Luke xxii. 53). Satan, by sin, becomes darkness concentrated, and, as it were, personified—plunged in the region that lies outside God, who is the Light. In "darkness" we have a so-called "*Johannic* word," which is yet common to him with St. Luke and St. Paul—of which we have proof that *Christ* was the author—and which passed into the common stock of Christian speech.

**14.** *In whom we have* **that** *redemption* **which is the** *remission of sins.*] "Quam totam redemptionem remissio peccatorum

visible God, the firstborn of every creature:

16 For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions,

---

complectitur" (Est.). External authority and internal evidence are alike in favour of the omission of the words, "through His blood," which probably came in from Eph. i. 7.

*we have.*] In the pregnant Johannic and Pauline sense, "we have and hold."

**that** *redemption.*] The metaphor changes from "a *victor* rescuing by force, to a *philanthropist* releasing by payment." (Bishop Lightfoot.) The same great critic also points out the probability of the Apostle's employing in this emphatic expression a tacit, yet very powerful polemic against the Gnostic conception of "redemption." The communication of mystic secrets, in connection with an elaborate system of angelology, was probably asserted by them to be the redemption. (P. 143.) Against those who made "redemption" consist in this, St. Paul uses language very like that which Zacharias employed in his song, when he defines "salvation" as consisting, not in emancipation from a foreign yoke, but "in remission of sins." ("Knowledge of a salvation consisting in remission of their sins," St. Luke i. 77.) Redemption does not consist in initiation into a fanciful angelology, but in participation of a real forgiveness. Note how the Apostle passes, as it were, through the porch of redemption in this verse, to gaze himself, and lead us to gaze, into the highest heaven, where the Eternal Personal Image of God is with Him—and over the universe of which He is the Creator.

vv. 15–19. The general connection of the passage, as a whole, is as follows:—

*These vv. speak of Christ.*—Vers. 12, 13 set forth the great benefits conferred upon us by the *Father*. After mentioning "the Son of His love," at the close of ver. 13, and our redemption through His death, and the essential character of the redemption, v. 14, the Apostle proceeds to glorify *Him* (vers. 15–19). He is—

A. The Centre of the *old* creation (vv. 15, 16, 17);

B. The Head of the *new* creation (ver. 18);

*Therefore:* C. Ever continuing Chief and First in *all*,

[This agrees with Bishop Bull's analysis of the passage, which closes with the pithy sentence,—"ut omnimodo ratione sc. tam restitutionis quam institutionis, tum qua principium mundi, tum qua caput Ecclesiæ, supra omnes præmineret."—Judic. Eccl. Cath. v. 8.]

In ver. 19, the Apostle goes back to the counsel of *God*, and speaks of the reconciliation as the good pleasure of *God*, while *Christ* is the medium through which that good pleasure is carried out. "It pleased the *Father*" (A.V.) should rather be, "**God was pleased,**" "**It was God's good pleasure that**—"

There is a quiet majesty in the *αὐτός*, *fourteen* times repeated by St. Paul between vers. 16–23, *twelve* times certainly referring to *Christ*, and *twice* in a way in which we can scarcely definitely distinguish. [The mode in which *αὐτός* is used, sometimes emphatically of *Christ* (cf. on 1 St. John i. 5), sometimes in a synthesis in which Christ and God are blended and cannot be separated by critical analysis, is one of the strongest proofs of St. Paul's entire possession by the thought of the true and proper Divinity of the Son of God.]

When we pass on to the mode of the reconciliation, the reference is to *Christ*, through whom God moulds His purpose and executes His beneficent will. The part of *Christ* in redemption is the new theme.

As to the use of one important word. "Image" (*εἰκών*), in the New Testament, comes to be employed in a sense which is exactly opposite to that of the Hebrew word of which it is a translation in the LXX. The Hebrew צֶלֶם means a shade or phantom, and is applied to seeming existence, unreality of being (Ps. lxxiii. 20); hence metaphorically to any image or likeness. But in the Ep. to the Hebrews *εἰκών* is used as the exact *antithesis* to that which is *shadowy*,—"The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the *very image* of the things"—(Hebrews x. 1), and may be literally translated by the phrase of Cicero which opposes the 'solid and express image' (*solida et expressa effigies*) to the 'shadow.' With the idea of embodiment and realization in the word *image* two others came to be blended: (a) the image and likeness of God, after which man was made, was applied to Christ Jesus ("Christ, who is the *Image of God*," 2 Cor. iv. 4; Coloss. iii. 10); (b) In the Platonizing speculations of Philo, the Image of God ran parallel with the Logos, of which it was an attribute. Thus, by the speculations of Hellenistical writers of various schools, and by the Chaldee paraphrasts—by Oriental thought derived primarily from Solomon, and by Hellenistic thought prompted by the Book of Wisdom—Christ's way was as truly made ready in Theology as it was in a different sphere by the Jewish ritual.

Digitized by Google

or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:

17 [a]And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

[a] 1 Cor. 8. 6. John 1. 3.

18 And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that [‖]in all *things* he might have the preeminence.

‖ Or, *among all*.

15. "Of that God who is not seen, and cannot be seen" (τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου). This attribute of God is placed in a form so emphatic, because it is explanatory of "the Image." Christ is the Image of that God who is not, and cannot be, seen otherwise. In that Image only can man see God. It is exactly St. John's thought: "No man hath seen God at any time. The only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He and no other (ἐκεῖνος, *exclusive*), interpreted Him to us once for all" (ἐξηγήσατο, St. John i. 18), by the language of His Incarnation. Compare the language of Hebrews, i. 3: "The offraying of the Father's glory, and the stamped copy of His substance." "In ver. 15 St. Paul is scattering seeds of thought, from which he may afterwards refute the worshippers of angels." (Bengel.)

*the first-born of every creature*] (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως). On the history and interpretation of the word "First-born," see Additional Note. The meaning of the term has been best explained by the greatest of dogmatic theologians, who enjoyed the advantage of speaking and thinking in Greek. "When He is called 'First-born of creation,' it is not as One put quite on a level with things created, and antecedent to them only in time, that He is styled First-born—how could it be so, seeing that He is only Begotten?—but on account of the condescension of the Word to creation" (Athanas. Orat. ii. 62). "It is not said with any condition annexed, but absolutely, 'the only-Begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father' (St. John i. 18). But the 'First-born' here has the condition of creation annexed by St. Paul (sc. *for in Him were all things created*, v. 16). But, if all things were created in Him, He is different from, and not one of the creatures, and He is not a created thing, but the Creator of things created. Therefore, He is called 'First-born' not on account of His coming from the Father, but on account of the Creation having been brought forth into existence in Him. And as before Creation He was the Son . . . so before being called 'First-born of every creature' He was the Word who was with God, and was God. It is clear that He is called 'First-born,' not on His own account as if He were a creature —nor as having any relation in His essence with the whole creation—but because the Word, when creating all things in the beginning, condescended to things created, that they might be able to come into existence." (Athanas. ibid. and 63). The connection of the words in v. 16 (ad init.) may be clearly put in the form of question and answer, thus—Why is He the First-Born of every creature? Because all things were created in Him, (i.e. because He is *not* a creature).

16. *all things were created* in *Him*, *by one creative act* (ἐκτίσθη).] That creative act, the first original relation of creation to the Creator, was brought about after a type whose lines were laid in the eternal Mind of the Firstborn (ἐν αὐτῷ). With the aor. at beginning of the verse contrast carefully the pft. at its close. "All things **continue in creation**" (ἔκτισται), have been called into creation and continue so by Him and for Him. The present abiding relation of creation to its God continues through Christ. "The conservation of things is nothing but a sort of continuous creation" (Estius). St. Paul's thought here is precisely that of St. John and of our Lord (St. John i. 3, 4; v. 17). We have in St. John the distinction between the original act of creation, and the continuance of all things in creation indicated similarly by a change of tense (ἐγένετο, γέγονεν, St. John i. 3). This central coherence of *Pauline* and *Johannic* Christology upon the part assigned to the Son in *Creation* was brought out with much power by the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, A.D. 269. After quoting St. John i. 3 and Colossians i. 16, the letter of the Bishops proceeds: "*All things were made by Him and for Him.* Even so, as by one truly existing and energizing—as by Him who is both Word and God; through whom the Father made all things, not as through a mere instrument or impersonal principle of knowledge (δι' ἐπιστήμης ἀνυποστάτου)—the Father having begotten the Son as a living, existing, Personal Energy, working all in all." (Routh, Reliq. Sacr. iii. 293.)

This doctrine is one of great importance in an age of natural science and speculation. The Word of God is the centre of creation. The order of the universe is the reflection of His thought. He made and sustains all things. The life, coherence, development, system of the universe are from Him, in Him, to Him. (See Mr. Ll. Davies's excellent remarks, Epistle of St. Paul, &c., P. 9.) The Apostle in this verse seems to have Ps. xxxiii. 6 in his mind.

*thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers.*] Probably referring, in this exuberance of language, to the angelic hierarchy, as conceived by Gnostic Judaism. Not with-



Digitized by Google

19 For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell;

20 And, [1] having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things in earth, or things in heaven.

21 And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies [1] in *your* mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled

[1] Or, *making peace.*

[1] Or, *by your mind in wicked works.*

---

out reason has a Greek Father found in these glowing words a probable reminiscence of that which was actually beheld by him who was "caught up to the third heaven." "He might have seen so much"! (St. Greg. in Ezek. Hom. 8.)

17. All *things collectively—the whole universe of things* **coheres into system** *in Him.*] The passage, Proverbs viii.–ix. 12, should be carefully studied with Notes (Volume IV. 553)—"Words uttered by Christ before He was in the Flesh. They are gospel before any gospel of them all; as good gospel as if recorded by any of the four" (Bp. Andrewes' Works, iv. 277). The eternal wisdom (1) from everlasting (Proverbs viii. 22, 23), (2) in creation (ibid. *vv.* 25, 29), (3) with man (*vv.* 30, 31), answers to Christ in Colossians i. 15, 16, 18—(1) the Image of the Invisible God; (2) creating all things; (3) the Head of the Church.

18. For the thought of the new creation thus linked to the old, and both brought into connection with Christ, cf. the ancient Christian hymn.

"But even while the world came forth,
In all the beauty of its birth,
In Thy deep thought Thou didst behold
Another world of nobler mould;
For Thou didst will that Christ should frame
A new creation by His Name."

Hymn for Septuages. Sunday, in 'Hymns Ancient and Modern.'

*who is* **Beginning.**] ἀρχή (cf. ἀρχαί supr. ver. 16. He is the Beginning of all beginnings). The Greek word (ἀρχή) blends the two notions of temporal and causative beginning. ("That by which anything begins to be, its principle, and cause." The philosopher Anaximander, is said to have first used the word in this sense seven centuries B.C. Cf. Simplic. in Arist. Physic. f. 6 and 32 (Grimm, *Lex. N. T.* p. 52). It is at once beginning and creative principle. So, "The Beginning of the creation of God" (Apoc. iii. 14). Note also that 'First-born from the dead' is another *Johannic* title of Christ (Apoc. i. 5); so that this verse supplies another point of contact between the Christology of St. Paul and that of St. John.

19. *that in him should all* **the fulness**] In all others—patriarchs, apostles, prophets, angels—the Spirit was given "by measure" (St. John iii. 34). The whole Fulness of the Divinity abode permanently in Him ("quasi si dicas *summaliter*," Pelag. ap. Hieron.). On the Fulness, see note on Ephes. i. 23.

*dwell.*] "abide permanently"—as distinct from and opposite to a transitory visit (cf. μόνος παροικεῖς, "art thou only a visitor?" St. Luke xxiv. 18). (Compare "the Spirit *remaining* on Him," St. John i. 33.)

20. It was God's good pleasure through Christ to reconcile all things in heaven and earth. The Apostle, no doubt, mainly (see Note at end of Chapter) thinks of angels and men, who are united as one body in Christ, their Head. And the pacification has been produced by His blood, shed upon the cross, by His actual death. (Upon the blood, see on 1 St. John i. 7.)

*and having made peace through the blood of His cross*] See Chrysostom's beautiful exposition: "It is great to 'reconcile;' greater 'through Himself;' greater again 'through His blood;' greatest of all 'through His cross.' Here are five things to be admired, *reconciliation, to God, through Himself, by death, by the Cross.*"

*things in* **the heavens**] Cf. Ephes. i. 10. "How? Things in the heavens thus—He transferred man there; He restored to them their enemy. Not only did He cause things on earth to be at peace: He raised an enemy to the heavens. Hence deep peace. Angels are seen again on earth, since man has appeared in heaven." (Chrysost. in loc.) St. Paul's universalism is not literal and futuristic; it is at once historical and ideal.

**through Him** *to reconcile all things unto Himself.*] It will be noticed that the preps. "through" and "unto" are used, with unmistakable antithesis, here in the account of the new creation, and above, ver. 17, in that of the old creation. We are reconciled, as it were, into and towards Him, so as to be drawn near to Him—vitally united, and absorbed into, His supernatural life, as members of that body of which He is the Head.

21. *And you,* **once being** *in a state of* **estrangement and** *hostile in your mind, plunged as ye were in* **those wicked** *works of yours.*] In a state of estrangement from God, from Christ, from His Church, from hope—"hostile in your mind, which lay immersed, and had its very existence, in those evil works of yours." See notes on Ephes. ii. 16, iv. 18.

Digitized by Google

22 In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight:

23 If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and *be* not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, *and* which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister;

---

**22.** *In the Body of his flesh, through* **that death** *of his.*] The exuberant fulness of language here is anti-idealistic—to distinguish broadly the natural, literal, historical Body which hung upon the Cross in all the reality of human infirmity, from the mystical, ideal body, mentioned in ver. 18, not without reference probably to Doketic notions, always latent in Gnosticism. The Apostle speaks of the true Humanity, with its capacity of suffering and death.

**23.** *If ye continue (i.e. as ye surely will) in the faith.*] Such is the force of εἴγε with the indicative.

*grounded.*] The idea as applied to the spiritual life seems to be directly derived from our Lord's words (St. Luke vi. 48) "**having the foundation laid.**"

*and settled.*] Means the consequence of having the foundations laid. The first, having a foundation external to themselves upon the Rock, which is Christ; the second, a consequent stability within themselves.

*and not* **being** *moved away.*] The neg. here (μή) is subjective—"moved away" is a word sometimes used of change and turbulence in political life. Not of such a character as is in a chronic state of rebellion and revolution against the gentle sway of the hope which the Gospel gives. On this meaning of the word, with a possible allusion to the *conservative* tone of the Colossian mind, see Introduction.

*to every creature . . . under heaven.*] See above on ver. 6, and cf. Rom. x. 18.

**24.** The mention of his having become "a minister of the Gospel (διάκονος) fires his soul, and sets it in motion. "Now" should stand prominently (not, as in A.V. with "who now," from a wrong reading,) but in the sense of "**as it is,** I rejoice."

*and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, . . . for his body's sake, which is the church.*]

*fill up.*] The word ἀνταναπληρῶ is not found in the LXX, and only here in the N. T. One or other of two meanings alone has any degree of probability—(1) The ἀντι may mean supply coming from an opposite quarter, to make up deficiency. The antithesis is of two personal agents—Christ, the sinless Lord, leaves something to be supplied by His servant. This view is powerfully supported by Bp. Lightfoot. (See Additional Note at end of chapter.) (2) But another shade of meaning may be assigned, which perhaps gives the whole passage a sense at once profounder, and more coherent. 'Αντι also means *mutually, in turn.* Thus the ἀντι in ἀνταναπληρῶ gives a notion of a kind of response on the part of Christ's members, an "echo" and reflection of the voluntary sufferings of the Head (Mr. Ll. Davies). This view was adopted by many old critics. (See Pol. Synop., in loc.) St. Paul's meaning would be, "as Christ suffered for me, so I in turn suffer for the good of His Church."

*that which is behind.*] (τὰ ὑστερήματα, in the plural, with gen. of the thing whose defect is to be supplied. Cf. 1 Thess. iii. 10.) "**that which is lacking**"—"the remainders" (Hammond)—"ea quæ desunt" (Vulg.)—ἐλλείμματα (Chrysost.). "Though it cost me dear, yet it is not anything but joy to me—as, knowing that what I suffer is but some small remnant of those sufferings which Christ began on the cross for His body, the Church, and doth now, though He be in heaven, endure in the persecution of men" (Hammond).

*of the afflictions of Christ.*] Bp. Lightfoot shows that this cannot naturally signify (1) sufferings imposed by Christ; (2) sufferings endured for Christ's sake; (3) sufferings such as Christ's were, Christlike afflictions—(yet with τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ cf. τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Messianic works, such works as the Christ would do. St. Matt. xi. 2.) It must, then, signify, "afflictions borne by Christ." Christ's *sacrificial*, or *redeeming*, sufferings, are not here spoken of; were this the case, according to St. Paul's custom, death, or cross, or blood, would be used. All the afflictions of saints, martyrs, true believers, *do* fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ. Repeated sorrows, and self-denials, continue the afflictions which He began on earth (2 Corinth. i. 5, 7; Philipp. iii. 10). Christ endured *all* affliction *in general;* its various particular phases are yet to be traversed by each in his appointed turn. Just in the same way Christ "took our infirmities and bare our sickness" (St. Matt. vii. 17). Yet all sicknesses of Christ's servants, borne in Christ's spirit—with their opportunities of charity, gentleness, patience, resignation—are an ἀνταναπλήρωσις of Christ's afflictions—the "filling up," in fact, historically, and, so to speak,



Digitized by Google

24 Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church :

25 Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, [1] to fulfil the word of God ;

26 *Even* the mystery which hath

1 Or, *fully to preach the word of God.* Rom. 15. 19.

---

materially, of that which He "filled up" ideally, essentially, in principle. St. Paul does not speak of the sufferings of Christ recorded in the Gospels, endured upon the cross, or in the world for thirty-three years. He thinks of the sufferings, not in the Body of His Flesh, not in His person, but in His mystical body. The passion of St. Paul is an integral part of the Church's prolonged passion, and that of the Passion of Jesus Christ, (1) from the real union of Christ with His members; (2) from His intense sympathy with them. For redemption Christ suffered enough, and left nothing lacking. No supplement of a martyr's passion was needed. What is "behind" or "lacking" in that which is infinite? That which underlies St. Paul's language here is the thought of His Lord who had said to him from heaven, "Why persecutest thou Me? . . . Jesus whom thou persecutest" (Acts ix. 4, 5). He in his turn fills up that which is lacking of the afflictions, which are to be suffered by Christ in His members. A vacant place is left for him to fill up. St. Paul certainly knew that an important part was assigned to him. He might, without arrogance, speak of himself as adding an important "complement" to the total fore-ordained sum of the afflictions of Christ in His members. (See Additional Note on ver. 24.)

*whereof I am made a minister.*] This shows that in the previous words the Apostle is speaking of *edification* of the Church, not of *satisfaction* for sin. He is a minister, not a Mediator. The afflictions of which he speaks are for the Church's *discipline*, not for her *redemption*. 'He suffers for others, because Christ first suffered for him." (Pelag. ap. Hieron.)

**24.** *to fulfil.*] When a word becomes impressed on St. Paul's mind, he seems to dwell upon it with a kind of simple affection ("*un mot l'obsède,*") and to take pleasure in repeating it in various senses. πληροῦν and its kindred words are favourites in this Epistle. (Cf. i. 9, 24, 25; ii. 10; iv. 12-17. πλήρωμα, i. 19; ii. 9.)

**25.** *according to the dispensation of God.*] (οἰκονομίαν). This word means (1) dispensation, as by a steward, of a household or family; (2) fig. the dispensation of Divine gifts through Apostles. It generally includes the notion of *universal* distribution to the entire family of Christ, Gentile as well as Jew. (1 Cor. ix. 17; Ephes. iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 4.)

**26.** *The mystery.*] Words from the ancient initiations are favourites with St. Paul. (Cf. "perfect," v. 28; Philipp. iv. 12; *inf.* "sealed," Ephes. i. 13). *Mystery* in this place, and generally in Pauline Epistles, is accompanied by some words denoting *revelation* or *manifestation*, to signify a secret made known.

In two of the Epistles of the Captivity it seems to have two different aspects. In Ephesians (iii. 4–10) the mystery is the Church growing onward and upward, taking in the Gentiles in its advancing movement, shaping itself before men and angels in the increasing light. Here in Colossians the mystery is the inward and spiritual progress —the "growing up before the Lord"—the formation of the spiritual character ("Christ *in* you,"—not "*among* you," v. 27). We declare in the Creed our belief in the Holy Catholic Church. The "mystery" in Ephesians is the *catholicity*; the "mystery" in Colossians is the *holiness* of the Church. The exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians by a great commentator of the School of Antioch has a sentence here worthy to be recorded: "He calls His grace concerning the Gentiles a mystery, as being unrevealed to those before the dispensation, but their participation in it (he calls) the full knowledge of the mystery" (Theodor. Mopsuest., P. 929, edit. Fritzsche.) See notes on Ephes i. 9; iii. 3, 4, 9. It is significant of the deep impression made by this part of St. Paul's teaching, that Ignatius addresses the Ephesians as those who "were jointly initiated with Paul into the mystery" (Παύλου συμμύσται—'Epist. ad Ephes.' xii.).

*from ages and from generations.*] "From ages" (ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων) "unknown in remote periods of antiquity"; "from generations" (ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν) "unknown even in recent generations." (Bp. Lightfoot.) Or, it may signify "from the ages," the periods of time in which the world exists in chronic continuance, and "from the generations" who occupied those ages. The mystery, both here and in Ephes. iii. 9, is said to be hidden from "the ages." But there is a distinction in those to whom it is revealed. In the Ephesians there is an object of instruction to "the principalities and powers in heavenly places;" here to "the saints." The "mystery" in Ephesians is one of Divine *wisdom*, in Colossians one of Divine *grace*. That secret initiation of which St. Paul speaks in

Digitized by Google

been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints:

27 To whom God would make known what *is* the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ [1] in you, the hope of glory:

28 Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

29 Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

[1] Or, *among you.*

---

the former concerns the history of the Church; that of which he speaks in the latter concerns the history of the individual—an indwelling of Christ in the heart. (*inf.* v. 27, "Christ in you"). The former is a *prospect*, the latter is a *presence*. (cf. Ephes. iii. 16, 17; St. John xiv. 23.) The "mystery" is taken in the two senses of (1) God's purpose for the Church at large (Ephes. i. 9, 10); (2) God's purpose for the individual believer's heart (Coloss. i. 27). "St. Paul makes a distinction between "testimony" and "mystery"—the former is the object of faith, the latter of knowledge." (Remains of A. Knox, Esq., i. 438.)

*which is.*] More probably "**who is**"—(ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός). The mystery passes into the living Christ. For this absorption, as it were, into Christ or the Cross of that which is closely connected with Him, cf. a remarkable sentence in Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. IX. For the grammatical explanation of the relative agreeing in gender and number with that which *follows*, see Winer, 'Gramm.,' P. 143, edit. 3.

**27.** *Christ in you, the hope of glory.*] **The Glory.** Sc. "As far as He is in them, so far they have the hope of glory" (Bp. Davenant). "He is the Hope of the glory who has freely given us the reason to expect these things" (Theodor. Mopsuest. in Epist. ad Coloss., P. 929, edit. Fritzsche).

**28.**] Note the eager, impetuous, threefold "*every man*" which here rushes to St. Paul's lips. There may be the implied reference which so many have supposed to the Gnostic initiations—in *them*, the "teaching" and "presentation" of a few bewildered neophytes, flattered by the hierophant as the "perfect," who possess the most precious of secrets—in the Gospel, the initiation for all who will accept it, and its impartial blessings. Yet the passage is not merely polemical. The thought of Catholicity has become passionately dear to the Apostle. The shadows lengthen in the sunset. Yet he feels also that the glorious mystery (now manifested), which embraces a whole fallen race, is to take in this man and that. No individual is to be neglected in the pastoral work, but each is to be savingly initiated (cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 4, 5, 6). The flock is to be gathered in one by one, and each to be known by name. Compare the remarkable change and balance of the neuter by the masculine in our Lord's words.

"*all that* the Father giveth Me."
"*him* that cometh to Me."
"*all which* He hath given Me."
"I should raise *it* up again."
"that *every one*."
"I will raise *him up*."
St. John vi. 37, 39, 40.

There is, in this passage of Colossians, the same conviction of a vast mass and collection to be brought to the eternal life of the Resurrection, of which no individual is to be forgotten in the work of the ministry here, or in the presentation to Christ hereafter.

*warning and teaching.*] *Warning*, "ministers should be like *salt*"; *teaching*, "they should also be like *light*" (Bp. Davenant).

*perfect.*] See note, ver. 26, on St. Paul's love of mystagogic words.

**29.** *I also labour, striving.*] The first word here is probably *athletic* (cf. Philipp. ii. 16: "that I have not *run* in vain, neither *laboured* in vain"); the second is certainly so—"contending in the lists for the prize."

*According to His* **inworking** *which* **inworketh** *(or, His* **energy** *which* **energises**) *in me mightily.*] It is St. Paul's conviction that Christianity is a life and power. Cf. "For He who is continually **inworking** in you both the **willing** and the **inworking** on behalf of His good pleasure is God." (Philipp. ii. 13.)

## ADDITIONAL NOTES.

### ver. 2.

Bp. Lightfoot thinks that ἐν Κολασσαῖς is beyond doubt the reading here, but that the title is πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς—a proof that the title is somewhat later in time; while the very fact of variation in orthography may well be an indication of the obscurity into which the city had fallen. (Pp. 16, 17.)

*Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our*

Digitized by Google

*Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.*] The evidence of the uncial MSS *for* and *against* the retention of "the Lord Jesus Christ" is almost equally balanced, with a slight preponderance *for*. Origen states that in Colossians the salutation is from the Father only ('Opp.' iv. p. 467). Chrysost. expressly says that in this passage St. Paul does not give the name of Christ ('Opp.' xi. 324; cf. 'Hom.' xxx. on 2 Corinth. xiii. 13; 'Op.' x. 651). Griesb., Tisch., Bp. Lightfoot reject the words; Lachm. places them in brackets; Huther, Beng., Meyer, approve the omission. But the words might have been omitted from a dogmatic scruple of the copyists, to whom it might easily have seemed that it was against the whole analogy of Pauline and Scriptural feeling to use a form of expression which, as it stands here, might be construed as "Father of *us*, *and* of the Lord Jesus Christ. "It is certainly more conceivable that the copyists should have omitted the words for this, or some other reason, than that this absolutely *singular* deviation from St. Paul's invariable practice should have occurred." (See the full discussion in Reiche, 'Comment. Crit.' ii. Pp. 250–252.)

ver. 6.

We read with Tischend. and Reiche—*τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ ἔστιν καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν.*

*πάρειμι* is often the translation of בּוֹא in the LXX.

*ἐπέγνωτε.* For the distinction between *γινώσκω* and *ἐπιγινώσκω*, as between partial and thorough knowledge, see especially 1 Cor. xiii. 12. (*ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομεν κ.τ.λ.*)

ver. 13.

"Translated," *μετέστησεν* is the word used of the great deportation of Israel, 2 Kings xvii. 23 (cf. of Jehoahaz, ibid. xxiii. 33). See Bp. Davenant in loc. Antiochus the Great thus "translated" two thousand Jewish families from Babylon into Lydia and Phrygia (Joseph. 'Antiq.' xl. 3, 4). The chief cities of Phrygia must probably have been among the stations for these Jewish colonists (Bp. Lightfoot, p. 19). Is it possible that St. Paul is here alluding to a circumstance which must have been much thought of among the Jewish race in Phrygia?

vv. 15–19, *seqq.*

(a) On Col. i. 15, *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, cf. Plato Timæus, x.:

*εἰκὼ δ' ἐπενόει διακοσμῶν ἅμα, οὐρανὸν* [*ὁ γεννήσας πατὴρ*] *κινητόν τινα αἰῶνος ποιῆσαι, καὶ . . . ποιεῖ μένοντος αἰῶνος ἐν ἑνὶ κατ' ἀριθμὸν ἰοῦσαν αἰώνιον εἰκόνα, τοῦτον ὃν δὴ χρόνον ὠνομάκαμεν.*

So that Time is the *εἰκών* of Eternity,—a manifestation of the infinite *αἰών* to the finite creation.

(b) For *πρωτότοκος* Bretsch. also refers to Jerem. xxxi. 9, Psalt. Sal. xiii. 8. *νουθετήσει δίκαιον ὡς υἱὸν ἀγαπήσεως, καὶ ἡ παιδεία αὐτοῦ ὡς πρωτοτόκου*, ib. xviii. 4; 4 Esdras vi. 58; "*nos autem populus tuus quem vocasti primogenitum.*"—Lex. Man. N. T. p. 361.

This word is first used of Israel, as the ideal Son of God (Exod. iv. 22); then of the Messiah (Psa. lxxxix. 28) [בְּכוֹר], *πρωτότοκος*, LXX. It implies *sovereignty*, as well as *priority*. The Arian and Socinian interpretation, which would infer from this that He is indeed the first of creatures, but a creature still, is contradicted in the context: (1) by the part assigned to Him in the creation of all things (*δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκτίσθη τ. π.* ver. 16); (2) by the assertion of His existence before all things ("He is before all things," *ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων*, ver. 17.[1]) "If before creation the Son was not begotten but created, He would have been called First-created, not First-born." S. Basil, 'c. Eunom.' iv. 2: see Swete's note, Theodore of Mopsuestia, i. 263.

The true interpretation of *πρωτότοκος* is, "He who existed as the Only-Begotten before the universe of things and beings created by God."[2] Some modern critics (especially Usteri[3] and Baur[4]) argue that St. Paul held the Logos to be among the number of created existences, and inferior to the Divinity; a view, as we have seen, contradicted by the whole context.

ver. 20.

Not exclusively. The thought of the discord and vanity of creation is often present to St. Paul. It has been finely said upon Rom. viii. 22, "personne n'a mieux compris les *larmes de la Nature*" (Renan). "It may be said, not unfitly, that Christ has reconciled to God all things, both in earth and heaven—men, *properly*, by bearing their sins and God's wrath upon sin; angels, *analogically*, by taking away from them the possibility of falling;—the whole fabric of the universe, by freeing it from the bondage of corruption and restoring it to its native beauty." (Bp. Davenant, 'Expos. Ep. ad Coloss.' p. 134.)

---

[1] Cf. "Before Abraham was brought into being, I EXIST." *πρὶν 'Α. γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμί.* St. John viii. 58.

[2] See Grim. 'Clav. N. T.' p. 381. "*πρωτότοκος* (St. Matt. i. 25; St. Luke ii. 7) is the same as *only*. Here it means that the generation of Christ is before all creation of creaturely existences, and, therefore, before angels."—(à Lap. xix. 76.)

[3] 'Paulin. Lehrbegriff,' P. 315.

[4] 'Das Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrh.' P. 296.

Digitized by Google

ver. 24.

In the *locus classicus* from Demosthenes (περὶ τῶν συμμορῶν), cited by all lexicographers, ἀνταναπληροῦν unquestionably has this meaning. See Liddell and Scott, s. v.

See especially Mr. Ll. Davies's view of this passage, 'Epistles of St. Paul,' p. 94. St. Augustine's interpretation is very beautiful: "Christ is still suffering affliction; not in *His* very Flesh, in which He has been received into Heaven, but in *my* flesh, which still labours and is sorrowful upon earth." Galat. ii. 20. Enarrat. in Ps. cxlii. "*Ut adimpleam.* What? What remains, what is behind? To whom is it wanting? To the afflictions of Christ. But where wanting? In my flesh. . . . Was any affliction wanting to the Man whom God the Word took into union with Himself? For He suffered all things. For on the Cross He took the vinegar at the close and said *Perfectum est.* What means that *Perfectum? Nothing* is wanting to the full measure of His sufferings; because all things written of Him are fulfilled, therefore all His sufferings were fulfilled – but fulfilled in the *Head.* Sufferings of Christ still remain behind, but in the *body.* But *ye* are the body of Christ, and His members; therefore, as the Apostle was among those members, he could say, 'adimpleo quæ desunt pressurarum.'" (Ibid. Ps. lxxxvi.). "All the afflictions of Christ and Christians belong to one common republic of Christ and Christians." (Ibid. Ps. lxi.)

Bishop Lightfoot, while admiring this interpretation, considers that, critically, there is one fatal objection to it. It empties the ἀντι in ἀνταναπληρῶ of its proper force, or rather, contradicts it. For the central point of this interpretation, he urges, is the *identification* of the afflicted Christian with his afflicted Lord, while the central point of the ἀντι is the *distinction* of the Christian from his Lord. The objection would, however, be removed if the interpretation of ἀντι given above be adopted. It is well known that on ver. 24, and mainly on ἀνταναπ. ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, modern Roman Catholic theologians base the doctrine of the sufferings of saints being profitable to the faithful in the form of remission of sins, which is technically termed *Indulgence.* Yet the greatest Roman Catholic commentators have seen that any interpretation of this passage, which brings in the idea of *satisfaction* at all, brings in an idea which they themselves reject as *impious.* "As if," cries Estius, "Christ had not suffered enough for redemption, and therefore needed a supplemental satisfaction of martyrs! It is *impious* to believe this, and not less impious to attribute it to Catholics." The same writer admits that, while the doctrine of satisfaction of Saints is assuredly Catholic and Apostolic, it "*cannot be solidly concluded* from this passage. . . . Such a statement on St. Paul's part might possibly have some arrogance." See also his summary of the general interpretation of the Greek Father (ii. p. 666).

---

## CHAPTER II.

1 *He still exhorteth them to be constant in Christ,* 8 *to beware of philosophy, and vain traditions,* 18 *worshipping of angels,* 20 *and legal ceremonies, which are ended in Christ.*

FOR I would that ye knew what great [1]conflict I have for you, and *for* them at Laodicea, and *for* as many as have not seen my face in the flesh;

[1] Or, *fear, or, care.*

2 That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ;

---

1. *For I would that ye knew what great conflict.*] *For* refers to the previous verse. "I also labour **contending**—I say *contending, for* I wish you to know what great *contest*" (ἀγῶνα referring to ἀγωνιζόμενος).

*as many as.*] The word ὅσοι here implies the whole class to which those mentioned belonged (see Acts iv. 6; Apoc. xviii. 7). Laodicea and Colosse are again joined in this epistle *infra*, iv. 16. The language in this place confirms still further the inference that St. Paul did not know the Church of Colosse personally. He was in deep anxiety for the Churches of Asia Minor, and especially for those of Phrygia. It would seem, from the turn of his expression here, as if he felt this peculiarly in the case of Churches of which he knew nothing personally, and which were founded by his delegates. It is remarkable that familiar personal addresses—"brethren, beloved," and the like—are totally absent from this letter alone. (See however further discussion of the question in Pref. to Epistle to Philemon.)

2. *being knit together.*] "**They** being **knit** together." Nominative absolute—*not* agreeing with "hearts."

*to the* **full knowledge** *of the mystery of*

Digitized by Google

Or, *wherein.*

3 [1]In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

4 And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.

5 For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding your order, and the stedfastness of your faith in Christ.

6 As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, *so* walk ye in him:

7 Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.

8 Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit,

---

*God*, **even Christ.**] The Text. Rec. "of God, and of the Father, and of Christ," may be condemned without scruple. (See Note at end of Chapter.)

3. *In* **whom are all** *the treasures of wisdom and knowledge* **hidden.**] The word 'hidden' (ἀπόκρυφοι) stands with very marked emphasis at the close of the verse. It is used with peculiar suitability of treasure (Note that *apocryphal* was originally used of esoteric writings of heretics, which were kept in mysterious secrecy, and later on of false and spurious documents. Early Christian writers used the term to denote, not deutero-canonical, but mendacious and heretical. (Bp. Lightfoot and Dict. B. *s. v.*) Note also that four words in this verse (*wisdom*, *knowledge*, *treasure*, *hidden*) have a strong Gnostic tinge, and no doubt refer to Gnostic ideas. For those who receive Scripture, this verse is simply decisive upon the *infallibility* of Christ. The old dogmatic interpreters expound it of the Divine knowledge of Christ, but maintain that it extends to His Human knowledge. From the wisdom of the uncreated Word, the plenitude of wisdom flows over into the Human Soul with which it is hypostatically united. (The context speaks directly of the *Divine* knowledge. Cf. *infra*, ver. 9.)—"Treasures" for *abundance*. "All" because *nothing* is *excepted.* Hidden in Him," i. e. *Him alone*. Thom. Aq. says that *wisdom* has for its object things divine, and *knowledge* things human."

4. *beguile you with* **persuasive speech.**] Certainly used of cheating. (See in respect of money, quotation in L. and Scott, *s. v.* παραλογίζομαι.) Here by "specious reasoning" (πιθανολογία, a technical school term), "by the dexterous use of *probable* arguments" opposed to *demonstration* of the spirit, as it is opposed by Plato to the *demonstration* of science (Theætet. 163). "By saying things that look like *probabilities*, but are not" (Hammond). (*Persuasibilitas*—Est.) "In *verisimili* sermone" (August.).—"Deceivers by plausible argument" (Keble, 'Studia Sacra,' p. 228). "Some were trying to deceive the Colossians by sophisms of the Hellenic type" (σοφίσμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς) Synops. S.S. wrongly attributed to Athanasius (see Athanas. Opp. iv. 420, edit. Migne.)

5. *in the spirit.*] Cf. 2 Kings, v. 26 (quoted by almost every commentator since Pelagius); 1 Cor. v. 3. It does not necessarily imply direct prophetic knowledge, but may certainly include it.

*joying* **because I see.**]

*your order*, *and the stedfastness of your faith* **towards Christ.**] The Apostle looked forth from Rome with that spiritual second sight to which distance is as nothing. He surveyed Churches remote in space, the Colossian among the rest. In praising its condition, he uses an image derived from the order and solidity of the soldiers of the Prætorian Guard, whom he saw so constantly during his captivity. (Cf. Philipp. i. 13; cf. military image in Ephes. vi. 11, *seqq.*; and again in Philipp. iv. 7.) 'Order' (τάξις) properly consists in the due disposition of parts in reference to the whole; hence, as here, military order—'steadfastness' (στερέωμα) lit. "what is made firm"; hence, sometimes the solidified body, the solid strength of an army. (So 1 Macc. ix. 14, cf. ibid. x. 50.) The first is the orderly organization, without which strength evaporates; the second the solid strength, without which order is a hollow parade. The Church's proper organic form and solid definite conviction of the unalterable elements of the Christian Creed are closely connected in the Apostle's mind, as they have been in the history of the Church. The Colossian Church presents itself to him as an army—as to the Church's organic *form*, in serried order; as to the Church's *Creed*, solid at the core.

6. *walk.*] For the word, see on 1 S. John i. 6.

7. *Rooted* (ἐῤῥιζωμένοι), *in process of being continually built up* (ἐποικοδομούμενοι).

*in Him.*] Christ is both the root and the foundation.

8.] See to it lest there be some one (μή τις); I do not say more—you can guess my meaning—to carry you off as his spoil (ὑμᾶς . . . ὁ συλαγωγῶν): "some one not to take spoil *from* you, but to make you

Digitized by Google

after the tradition of men, after the [1]rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

10 And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power:

11 In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made

1 Or, *elements.*

---

his spoil." This expression powerfully grasps the essence of the proselytizing spirit; the proselytizer's spoil *is* the person proselytized. "He aims at doing this through that which is at once in its arrogant claims a high philosophy, and in its miserable reality an empty deceit (διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης); a philosophy artful, moulded in accordance with an esoteric system, pervaded by five fatal deficiencies. (1) It is merely *traditional*, and, therefore, of precarious truth. (2) It is *human*, and, therefore, deficient in authority. (3) It is *elementary*, belonging to "the outworn creed," to the rudiments of religion, and, therefore, unfitted for Christian manhood. (4) It is *material*, not connected with the soul's true home and centre, but with the palpable and external, (τοῦ κόσμου), and is, therefore, deficient in *spirituality*. (5) And, being this, assuredly, and as matter of fact, it is not *after Christ*.

*through philosophy and vain deceit.*] The two grand Greek words, "philosophy" and "virtue," are used by St. Paul only once: "philosophy" here, "virtue" in Philipp. iv. 8. There are words exalted by the world which the Gospel depresses, and words despised by the world which the Gospel exalts. See Additional Note at end of the chapter for 'rudiments of the world.'

**9.** *For in him dwelleth* (κατοικεῖ) *all the fulness of the Godhead,* **in bodily wise**]. Here is the proof of the last words of ver. 8, "not *after Christ; for* in Him," &c. Three things are here: (1) the dwelling—"in Him;" (2) the Dweller—"the fulness of the Godhead;" (3) the mode of dwelling—"bodily."

*bodily.*] The two great doctrinal statements of St. Paul here are once more the exact counterpart of St. John. "All the fulness of the Godhead" corresponds to "The Word was God" (St. John i. 1). "Dwelleth bodily" is the counterpart of The Word was made flesh." (S. John i. 14.) St. Paul's dogmatic language is as carefully guarded as St. John's. It is, perhaps, the only form which could have avoided the idea of "*limitation* of the Infinite, or *unreality* of the Body assumed" (as Bp. Lightfoot translates "in bodily wise," "with a bodily manifestation.") The dogmatic force of this verse is powerfully given by the Council of Antioch, A.D. 269. "We affirm that the Son . . . is God and Lord of the total of things created; but that having been sent from the heavens by the Father, and having taken flesh, He was made Man. Wherefore, even the Body from the Virgin containing all the fulness of the Godhead in bodily wise, [the Manhood] is immutably united to the Godhead, and taken into God. (τεθεοποίηται)." Routh, 'Reliq. Sacr.' iii. 298. For Christological doctrines common to St. Paul and St. John, see *supra* i. 15, 16, 18.

*of the Godhead.*] Such abstract expressions for God are very rare with St. Paul—θεότης only here; θειότης only Rom. i. 20; τὸ θεῖον only Acts xvii. 29—no doubt from the feeling that they might tend to obscure the Personality of God.

**9, 10.** *ye are complete.*] The fulness of the Godhead is in Christ; and in a sense, lower indeed, yet quite true, *your fulness* is in Him. The perfection of the Divine character, and the perfection of humanity, meet in Christ. "In Him man has a complete Ideal" (Mr. Ll. Davies); "and ye are by a vital union in Him, being filled with His fulness, who is the living Source, the Head of all principality and power. Ye are filled, not by angels, but by their Lord."

**11.**] Having been once for all circumcised in union with Him with a circumcision which has three characteristics—(1) *Internal and spiritual* efficacy; an operation deeper than human hand can work. (2) *Universality*, "having its sphere in the putting off of the body of the flesh" (certainly not "the body of *the sins* of the flesh," as in A.V. See note on this phrase at the end of the chapter). It is not enough for the baptized Christian, who is true to the high ideal of the supernatural life, to cut off one or other member of the body which consists of a flesh corrupted by sin, but the whole. (3) It is a circumcision which is "of Christ," *Christian*, of which He is the Author. "Circumcision is no longer in the knife, but in Christ Himself. Not a hand, but the Spirit, confers the circumcision. It circumcises, not a part, but the whole man" (Chrysost. in loc.). "He calls it circumcision not *made by a hand*, to show the difference of its inworking—in one case a human hand, but here Divine Grace, which inworks the removal of Mortality's corruption." (Theod. Mops. i. 288, edit. Swete.)

Digitized by Google

without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

12 Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.

13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

---

**12.**] "Having been once for all buried with Him in your Baptism, in which ye are co-risen with Him through your faith in the energy of God, who raised Him from the dead;" or, "through that faith which is the result of the energy of God, who raised Him from the dead." The statement in ver. 11 makes Christian circumcision an intensely spiritual process. But man's nature craves for an external and visible symbol, which we have in Holy Baptism; and under the Gospel, the *sign* passes into an *efficacious sign* or *sacrament*. (Bp. Davenant.)

*Buried with Him.*] See on Rom. vi. 4. It is with St. Paul a principle that the whole Christian life is a following of the blessed steps of one most holy Life, an imitation of Christ. We are conceived and born (Galat. iv. 19); crucified (Galat. ii. 20; Rom. vi. 5); dead (Rom. vi. 3, vii. 4; cf. 1 St. Peter iv. 1); buried (Rom. vi. 4); risen (Rom. vi. 5; Coloss. iii. 1); nay, ascended and reigning (Ephes. ii. 4, 5, 6) with Him. What is done or suffered by Him ***historically*** is done in us ***analogously*** and ***mystically*** now, and will be completed historically and actually hereafter. This is the underlying principle of the order of the Christian year.

**13.**] This may be paraphrased—"And *you*, being dead with a twofold death, in your miserably repeated transgressions, and in the whole unregenerate, spiritually uncircumcised condition of your flesh, with the weakness of its susceptibilities—*you*, God, by one blessed act, co-quickened with Christ, having given to *us*," (note the subtle delicacy of the change from ὑμᾶς, standing so emphatically at the beginning of the verse—followed by ὑμῶν, and another emphatic ὑμᾶς—to χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν) "(aye, to you and me!) once for all, of His free grace, the great gift of remission of those our transgressions." This "condonation" has *two* great features: it is ***gratuitous*** (χαρισάμενος), and it is ***universal*** (πάντα).

**14, 15.**] The general meaning seems to be this. "Having blotted out the bond against us, consisting in ordinances (or decrees), which were contrary to us—aye, and *has* taken it away" (note the perfect ἦρκεν, after the repeated aorists), "so as to prevent it from *intervening* between us and God (ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου) (ver. 15); having stripped off the principalities and powers which, as it were, clung to Him, He made a show of them with a glorious boldness" (see Note at end of chapter), "having led them in triumph in it" (sc. the Cross). In the interpretation of this passage we must remember the figurative grandeur of the language, corresponding to the sublimity of the subject-matter—the stir and glow of the Apostle's soul as he brings out "the paradox of the Crucifixion," and shows us how "the convict's gibbet is the victor's car." (Bp. Lightfoot). "No conqueror, loftily seated in his triumphal chariot, did ever yield a spectacle so gallant or magnificent; no tree was ever adorned with trophies so pompous or precious as the Cross." (Barrow, Serm. xxvi.; Pearson, Art. ii.). "Nowhere else has he spoken so magnificently!" (Chrysost.).

"In the ordinances" (τοῖς δόγμασιν). There are two different streams of interpretation of this passage, as δόγμα is taken in (1) a good, or (2) bad sense, as (1) a gracious rule, forming part of Christ's easy yoke, or as (2) a decree of the outworn obsolete law. The Latins generally take it as our A. V. in the latter sense, while the Greeks understand "dogmas" as *precepts of the Gospel*, as a means of abrogating mere legal ordinances. "Having by *His doctrines* blotted out." (Hammond.) (Hanc cautionem delevit decretis ut dicat resurrectionem et immortalitatem. Theod. Mops. i. 290. Theodore, both here and Ephes. ii. 15, understands by δόγματα "the facts and hopes of the Gospel.") This is a forced interpretation.

*blotting out . . . nailing*] There were two ways of cancelling a bill or bond: "by ***blotting***, or crossing it with a pen [rather, by expunging the letters of a wax tablet—(Bp. Wordsworth),] or by ***striking a nail*** through it." (Hammond.)

*the handwriting*] What is the handwriting? Commentators have pointed to (a) Gen. ii. 17; (b) Exod. xix. 8; (c) "the condemnatory sentence which *conscience* murmurs over to itself against itself from the decrees of

Digitized by Google

15 *And* having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them [1]in it.

16 Let no man therefore judge you [1]in meat, or in drink, or [1]in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days*:

17 Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ.

18 Let no man [1]beguile you of

[1] Or, *in himself*.
[1] Or, *for eating and drinking*.
[1] Or, *in part*.
[1] Or, *judge against you*.

---

the Divine law, Isaiah xliii. 5." (Melanchth.); (d) the written memorial, as it were, of sin, treasured up before God. Deut. xxxii. 34; Jeremiah xvii. 1. "This too is deleted on the cross; whilst, as sins are forgiven, the very memory of those sins is blotted out" (Pelag. ap. Hieron.). (e) *ceremonial rites*, which are χειρόγ. as memorials of man's guilt and debt. "Ceremonies, not as sacraments of grace, but as appendices of the law, are nothing but public professions of human misery." (Beza.) This meaning is confirmed by τοῖς δόγμασιν following (cf. Ephes. ii. 13).

*of ordinances*] χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν. "The dative is best explained by the idea of γεγραμμένον involved in χειρόγ." "The text of the Law was like the bill, or note of hand, of a debt which humanity was unable to discharge. Jesus has destroyed the amount of the bill by nailing it to His Cross." (Renan, *L'Antechrist*, p. 80.)

**15.** *having* **stripped off.**] The Greeks generally explain as above. The Latins interpret of Christ's putting off His Body in death. It has been suggested that the idea in St. Paul's mind here may be that Christ's Person was enveloped by the false teachers among the Colossians in a clinging mist, or swathing garment, of ethereal beings of the spirit-world, whom they loved to speak of by magnificent names, such as "principalities and powers;" and that He, in the glory of His Cross, stripped and disentangled Himself from all this." (Mr. Ll. Davies.)

**16-23.**] It is observed by Bp. Lightfoot that the order of arrangement in the last paragraph is here reversed. We have here (1) practical or ritualistic errors, vv. 16, 17; (2) theoretical errors, in regard to angelic mediation.

**16.** *Let no man . . . judge you.*] The indeterminate word *judge* (A.V.) is here strictly correct. The *judgment* might, conceivedly, be *favourable*. But the point was—not to submit to any usurping-self-asserting authority of the kind.

*in meat, or in drink.*] Cf. Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. viii. 8; Heb. ix. 11. The O. T. says very little of prohibited *drinks* (only in Levit. x. 9, xi. 34–36, and, for the Nazarites, Numbers vi. 3; Judges xiii. 4, &c.). Later Judaism, no doubt, added much (St. Matth. xxiii. 25), which would account for the general form of expression in Heb. ix. 10. The Essenes were probably vegetarians and total abstainers. (Rom. xiv. 2, 21; 1 Tim. iv. 3.)

*in respect of*] (ἐν μέρει) "in the division or category of; in that which concerns." The expression here was referred by some of the older commentators to the "turn" or "roster" of festivals; by others it was rendered as signifying "in or concerning *part* of a feast, on account of the violation of some *part* of a feast." Some festivals had multiplied ceremonials and extended over several days. If this be the allusion, while the Judaizers asserted that such festivals must not be even partially violated, St. Paul implies that they must not be even partially observed.

*a holyday, or of the new moon, or of a* **sabbath day.**] We have here an exhaustive enumeration of the Jewish days of observance—*annual* (as Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles); *monthly* (Numbers xxviii. 11); *weekly*, in the Sabbath day. They are thus classified in O. T. (2 Kings iv. 23; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4, xxxi. 3; Ezek. xlv. 7; Hosea ii. 11; cf. Isaiah i. 13, 14). Hence the division was recognised in the rubrical language of ritualistic Judaism (cf. Galat. iv. 10).

*or of the sabbath days*, A. V.] This should rather be "**a sabbath day**"; σάββατα occurs only once in the N. T. in a plural sense, established by a numeral ("three sabbath days," Acts xvii. 2) (See Note at end of chapter.)

**17.** *which are a shadow of things to come, but the* **substance belongs to Christ.**] "A shadow," because *unreal*, and *thrown before* (prænunciativæ observationes — Augustin.). The things thus *shadowed* are now exhibited and conveyed through Christ, therefore their "shadows" should be abolished.

**18.** *Let no man beguile you of your reward*] A. V., "rob you of the prize" (see general Note on the chapter), or rather perhaps "pronounce you unworthy of it."

*in a voluntary humility.*] We have to ascertain *first* the meaning of the word *humility* (ταπεινοφροσύνη). Bretschneider produces one passage from a later Greek writer in which it is applied to the *mean-spirited* humility of the Gibeonites, Joshua ix. 4. But there can be no doubt that the word in this form is found in no writer previous to the Christian era,

Digitized by Google

[1] Gr. *being a voluntary in humility.*

your reward [1] in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind,

19 And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

---

and that in the N.T. it always bears that favourable sense which the Gospel bestowed upon the world-despised adjective from which it is formed. (Acts xx. 19; Ephes. iv. 2; Philipp. ii. 3; Coloss. iii. 12.) In the LXX, ταπεινοφροσύνη is never found; but the adj. (ταπεινόφρων) is the translation of שְׁפַל־רוּחַ, *low of spirit* (Prov. xxix. 23). The verb (ταπεινοφρῶ) appears as the translation of שׁוה, to make level, to compose the soul into an attitude of humility. (Ps. cxxxi. 2.) The meaning of the word is essentially favourable, and expressive of that grace which the world inexorably condemns, but which Christ connects with His best promises. It is evident, therefore, that *humility*, in this place, is degraded and discoloured by the tinge which is given to it by its close connection with the words θέλων ἐν (*in a voluntary humility*). This is a rendering in the LXX of חפע ב, "taking delight in, having one's own inclination gratified in." Θέλω is used in pregn. sens. of that which a man does of his own motion (*ultro*), and passes over into the notion of sheer self-will and arbitrariness (cf. ἐθέλεχθρος. Thucyd. iii. 76). Thus we learn the important lesson that virtues and graces are too delicate for the rough admeasurement of mere hard-and-fast moral lines. Their beauty and acceptability depart. and may even turn into their opposites. Wilful self-complacency in humility is censured by St. Paul as inconsistent with the sweet unconsciousness of true humility. It becomes the worst pride, or the most abject meanness—the pride or the meanness which ape humility. The word ἐθελοθρησκεία (*infra* v. 23), shows that a strong sense of θέλω as intense self-will was present to St. Paul's mind. There, as here, self-will imparts a contamination to the virtue with which it is associated. Humility and worship themselves became pride and superstition. [Hence in St. Luke i. 48, ταπείνωσις should be rendered "low estate," not "humility." One who says, "I am humble," *is not* humble. Mary does not *profess* humility, she *practises* it.]

*worshipping of angels.*] "a *cultus*, or **religion of the angels**." (θρησκεία, gen. in a bad sense of Judaizing, or even idolatrous, superstition. See, however, a more favourable shade of thought in St. James i. 26, 27. Coleridge, 'Aids to Reflection,' p. 14.) There was a self-willed "parade of humility" in having recurrence to these glorious but created beings, instead of boldly using our access to the Throne of Grace. "From the beginning of the Epistle he carefully keeps the angels in their place" (Bp. Davenant). On angels and angelolatry, cf. August. Confess. x. 67. "Whom should I find to reconcile me to Thee? Should I seek to Angels? (ambiendum mihi fuit *ad Angelos?*) Many (as I hear) striving to return to Thee, and unable to do so by themselves, have tried these things, and have fallen into a desire for curious visions, and been considered worthy of illusions." For a beautiful contrast between the "verus ille benignusque Mediator" and 'maligni fallacesque mediatores," cf. 'De Civ. Dei.' x. 24. For a curious interpretation which makes the θρησκεία of angels simply a superstitious fear of their anger, in case the law was not strictly kept, see Theodore of Mopsuestia, vol. i 294 (edit. Swete).

*intruding into these things which he has not seen.*] Reasons for holding with the A. V. and retaining the negative will be found in Note 2 at end of the chapter. "Profoundly exploring (Bretschn. Lex. Man. *s. v.* ἐμβατεύω . . . *e. g.*, ἐμβατεύων for ἐμβαίνειν, ἐμβατεῖν, ingredi, pedem inferre—especially of places difficult of access, and peculiarly of gods entering their shrines or sacred precincts. So of Dionysos in the celebrated chorus descriptive of Colonos in the 'Œdip. Colon.' of Sophocles. Going deeply into things invisible and heavenly—things such as from his confident theories he might be supposed to have seen, but has not, and could not see" (ἑώρακεν, specially used of direct, intuitive knowledge of God; cf. 1 John iii. 6) (μή, subjective negative after *relative*, Winer, Pt. III. § lxv. p. 503). With the negative omitted, it would be, "subtly and curiously meditating upon, poring over, things which he has seen with gifted sight in vision" (so Lachm. Huther, Meyer).

*vainly puffed up.*] *Vainly* (εἰκῇ), "puffed up without reason." This affected parade of humility was merely a cloak for a swollen (φυσιώμενος) and exorbitant pride.

*his fleshly mind.*] **The mind of his flesh** (cf. Rom. viii. 7). *This*, from which he proposes to give emancipation, is precisely the weak and impure source of all his system.

Digitized by Google

‖ Or, *elements.*

20 Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the ‖ rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,

21 (Touch not; taste not; handle not;

22 Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?

23 Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and ‖ neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.

‖ Or, *punishing*, or *not sparing.*

---

**19.** *the Head*, **from Whom**] "The Head" is used in a sense so *personal* that St. Paul adds, "from Whom" in the masc.

*by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together.*] Junctions and ligaments, contact and attachment, "supply of nutriment," and "compacting of the frame" (Bp. Lightfoot; cf. Ephes. iv. 16). The leading idea here is "vital connection"; in Ephesians, unity in diversity." Bp. Lightfoot has an interesting note on the physiological accuracy of this, and he remarks that among St. Paul's intimate companions at the time was "Luke, the beloved physician" (Coloss. iv. 14).

*increaseth with the increase.*] Contact and attachment, nutriment and structural unity, issue in *growth.*

*of God.*] "The finite is truly united with the infinite." (Bp. Lightfoot.)

**20.** "You died once for all, in the great decisive moment of your spiritual life, with Christ. From the rudimentary and materialistic, you passed into the perfect and unchangeable. Why do you go on as if you lived in that old world? (εἰ ἀπεθάνετε. "In all cases the aorist, not perfect represents absolute crisis." (Bp. Lightfoot.) (On 'the rudiments of the world,' see *supra*, v. 8).

*subject to ordinances,*] We might almost translate, "rule-ridden." The ordinances might be (1) Mosaic, or (2) philosophical. If (1), they were obsolete; if (2) they were false.

**21.** "**Handle not, neither taste, neither touch**" (Bp. Lightfoot). A descending series of injunctions, the first being the strongest. The increase of the superstition is subtly denoted by the decrease of the rule in breadth. The rule becomes minuter as the superstition becomes intenser. This is well denoted by the imperatives,—aoristic *in sense* which point, not to broad general rules, but to *single acts* prohibited. [The μὴ ἅψῃ of the verse may be instructively compared with the μή μου ἅπτου of St. John xx. 17; the first "do not touch in this particular case:" the second "do not continue to touch or cling to Me.'" See Donaldson, Greek Gram., P. 414.]

**22.** *Which all are to perish with the using;*] Of the various interpretations of this difficult passage two may be selected: (1) "Handle not, neither taste, neither touch" (sub. things), "which things (ἅ) are all destined for corruption in the using." (Bp. Lightfoot). It gives additional interest to this interpretation that it would show our Lord's words in St. Mark vii. 18, 20, to have been present to St. Paul's mind; and the coincidence would be completed by the reference at the close of the verse to Isaiah xxix. 13. Cf. St. Mark vii. 6 *seqq.* (2) The other interpretation referred to accentuates the meaning of ἀπόχρησις as *abuse.* It seems to agree alike with St. Paul's concise energy, and with the dramatic vividness of the saying ascribed to the Judaizing teachers in ver. 21. St. Paul, in these words, continues the ever-recurring cuckoo cry of these ascetic teachers: "Handle not, neither taste, neither touch things, which all tend to spiritual corruption and injury by the *abuse* of them." *Abuse* was the word which these men were constantly applying to wine, meats, and other things. They thought that *abuse* was involved in their very *use.* (see Grimm. 'Lex. N. T.' p. 46).

**23.**] "All which class of things (ἅτινα) are things having a reputation for wisdom in self-devised religion—"voluntary, arbitrary religion, i.e. that which a man has thought out for and imposed upon himself. It is applied to the perverse observances of ascetics" (Grimm.)—as also in affected humility, and hard unsparing treatment of the body, yet are not of any real worth in relation to indulgence of the flesh." Many of the Fathers translate differently "unsparing treatment of the body, not holding it in any honour for reasonable satisfaction of the just demands and cravings of the flesh." The fatal objection to this interpretation is that πλησμονή is always used for the *too much*, not for that which is *enough*, and must mean something more than legitimate satisfaction.

Other views of this passage are "Not of any real value; nay, rather, in the last analysis, to the undue gratification of the flesh." This would seem an unduly strong statement.) Others again render "From their own point of view their doctrine is, hold not the body in any honour, so as to gratify the flesh to the full." Mr. Keble suggests:

Digitized by Google

"Which things have a show (not the substance) of wisdom in affected voluntary service and humility and unsparing use of the body, not in any real respect shown to it in the way of guarding against surfeit of the appetite." ('Studia Sacra,' p. 229.)

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18.

Of *nine* other readings, modern critics seem divided between three—(1) τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Χ., i.e. "of God, the Father of Christ." It is in accordance with St. Paul's strain of thought in this Epistle to denote the majesty of Christ by the *Father's* unique relation to Him. (2) The shortest reading (τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ) simply, without addition, has been received by Alf., Griesb. (3) The reading τοῦ μυστ. τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ has not the same external evidence as 1 (*sup.*). It is supported, however, by B. and S. Hilar. de Trin. i. 9.[1] Internally, the argument for it is strong. In the passage, St. Paul refers all to *Christ*. He is the Fountain of Divine knowledge. The relative (ἐν ᾧ, v. 3) must refer to Christ, according to the Apostle's intention—but for this the name of Christ must precede. Of this reading, Huther gives *four* possible interpretations: (*a*) a dependent genitive of μυστηρίου, "God-mystery" (Divine mystery) of Christ. This seems very forced. (*b*) A dependent genitive of Θεοῦ, "the mystery of the God of Christ." (*c*) Χριστοῦ in *app.* to Θεοῦ, "the mystery of God, Christ."—sc. of Christ, who is God. (S. Hil. de Trin. ix. 62 *ut sup.*). This is accepted by Bp. Wordsworth. Perhaps, however, we should rather expect another form of expression.[2] (*d*) "Mystery of the God of Christ," sc. "God who is Christ's God." Huth. quotes Ephes. i. 17, and argues that it is St. Paul's object to show *what* mystery he speaks of—viz. the counsel which God, in His special relation as *Christ's God*, formed for man's salvation. To these must be added a *fifth* interpretation, (*e*) which has the high authority of Bp. Lightfoot, "The mystery of God, even Christ." *Christ* being in apposition with mystery. The choice seems to lie between *c* and *e*.

### ver. 8.

Three forms of error—partly Gnostic, partly Judaistic—are referred to by the Apostle. (1) Philosophical speculation; but only so far as it is empty and deceitful. The Apostle loves to recognise all that is true in Greek speculation (Acts xvii. 23–28), while he combats all which an impure philosophical syncretism has added to the simplicity of the Gospel. Christian thought has ever followed these different attitudes. On the one hand, there are times when Christian thinkers seem to say with Tertullian—"when heretical dogmas grow weak and can fly no further, they find a rest in the thorny brakes of Aristotle. What have Athens and Jerusalem to say to each other?" At other times they claim, with Augustine, all truth, wherever found, as belonging of right to Christ; they feel that there is no region of thought or literature which may not illustrate Divine things. (2) He refers to human traditions, Judaizing practices and ceremonies, superstitious observances. (3) He mentions "the rudiments of the world" (τὰ στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου). Many of the older commentators saw here an allusion to actually Pagan ideas—an idolatrous worship of the earth and of the heavenly bodies—a tinge of the Gentile Pantheism which parcelled out the full power of God into particular potencies and elements. But the reference is more probably to Judaizing than to actually Pagan ideas. Teachers had come among them who wished to go back to the "*rudimenta* pædagogica," by which God had taught the Church during her early education—Mosaic rites, legal ceremonies, shadows of Christ to come. Through these, as first elements, God had trained His Church for a higher and more spiritual *cultus*, when it came to the maturity of manhood (Galat. iv. 1–9). The Apostle here aims not at the creature-worship of Gentile idolaters, but at the recurrence, in the full sunshine of the Gospel, to the twilight into which Judaizing teachers would plunge their spirits—the twilight of a rudimentary and elemental worship.[3]

The question has often been asked, how this stern condemnation coheres with St. Paul's own practice of "opportunism" in reference to Jewish rites. His feeling was that legal ceremonies were, as regards Christians, obscure in signification, weak in efficacy, burdensome in observance. Nay, worse than obscure. They involved in themselves, so far as they were voluntarily and *ex animo*

---

[1] In agnitionem *Sacramenti Dei Christi*—Deus Christus Sacramentum est (quoted by Reiche).

[2] Such as τοῦ Θεοῦ, or ὅς ἐστιν Θεός.

[3] στοιχεῖον, from στοῖχος, "order—series:" properly, "any first point from which the various parts of a whole are reduced to order; hence, *letters*, as elements of speech (*not*, however, written, but spoken)—*material elements* of the world—*axioms*, or *rudimental principles*, of

observed, a profession of faith in a Messiah who was to come. There are some doctrines and rites so closely connected that to teach the doctrine is practically to enjoin the rite, and *vice versâ*. It would be heresy and apostasy for a Christian to *say in words*, "Christ has not come; He is to come." It would be equally an act of apostasy to say so by signs and symbols in a language of *things* and *facts*. Therefore, to recur to the voluntary and habitual use of these things was simply the profession of a false faith (see August. c. Faust. xix. 16).

All rites and ceremonies of the Law were (according to the exhaustive division of the schoolmen) *sacrificia*, *sacramenta*, *sacra*, *observantiæ*. After the Passion and the proclamation of the Gospel, they could not be kept, without unfaithfulness, as the *first* to propitiate, as the *second* to sanctify, as the *third* for access to God, but only as the *last*, for public utility and avoidance of unnecessary scandal (cf. Acts xv. 20, xvi. 3, xxi. 26).

ver. 11.

"In putting off the body of the sins of the flesh" (A. V.). *ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς σαρκός* (Text. Recept.).

External and internal evidences are alike against *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* as a gloss for *τοῦ σώματος*.

What is the meaning of *τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκός*? How can *ἀπέκδυσις* be applied to it?

Many answer that "the body of the flesh" denotes "the body, which is composed of the flesh,"[1] that part of man in which the senses, desires, and emotions of the lower nature reside—and that the "putting" off of this means the renunciation of it, in as far as sin rises from the body, and mainly from the animal susceptibility (*σάρξ*).

Yet the phrase *σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς* can, surely, scarcely mean "the fleshly body, as the fountain and instrument of sin," with due regard to the Apostle's usage—any more than it can mean (what it might literally seem to signify,) "the shuffling off this mortal coil," the laying aside this mortal and fleshly body. We must look for the explanation in another quarter. How can men "put off" what is natural and necessary like the body? It would seem that "flesh" here must be used in the ethical and symbolical sense of the lower nature with its tendency to forbidden lusts and deeds. "The body" is not here the literal physical body, nor looked upon as an instrument of sin. The expression is figurative, a Pauline prosopopœia. Just so a *νοῦς* is attributed to the flesh (*inf.* v. 18). Single sins, in the same way, are called "members which are upon the earth" (iii. 5); where, by a figure, these sins are looked upon as so many earthly limbs of the hideous trunk of sin.[2] St. Paul speaks thus fully in order to oppose in the strongest way *partial* moral circumcision to *entire* spiritual circumcision. (So in Rom. vi. 6, *sin* is represented as having a *body*.)

Thus the whole passage may be paraphrased—"In Christ, in communion with Him, we were once for all at baptism circumcised with a circumcision, not *external*, but made without human hand: not *partial*, of a minute portion of the human flesh, but total, as if (to use a figure) we had put off the whole *body* of that sin and evil which is connected with *flesh*, not merely with this or that special *limb* of it."

This may be a fitting place to notice an important distinction in St. Paul's language generally between the *body* and the *flesh*.

*Body* (*σῶμα*) seems *never* to denote man's innate corruption. It is never that which at first as "fomes peccati," or afterwards as sin consummated by the will, is opposed to the law of God, and the leading of His Spirit. It is always (1) the complex totality of parts, and faculties which man possesses in virtue of his material organisation, or (2) man's nature, as connected with the play of the senses, the fountain of affections and emotions. But it is never used in a distinctly unfavourable sense, always in a sense which is good or indifferent. Man, indeed, may abuse his body (Rom. vi. 12, *seqq.*; 1 Cor. vi. 16; 2 Cor. v. 10[3]). But that body may, and ought to be, the instrument of the Spirit (Rom. vi. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 10; vii. 34; 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Thess. v. 23; St. James iii. 2). But there is something, even in the regenerate man, contrary to the higher reason as well as to the Divine law. There is a blind propension to certain objects presented by sense or by imagination; a fatal insurgence of appetite against reason and law. This is ever in St. Paul *flesh*, not *body* (Rom. vii. viii. xiii. 14; Galat. v. 13, *seqq.*; Coloss. ii. 18). When *σῶμα* means the seat and

---

any science. Such, in religion, were ritual precepts of the Judaizing schools, as expounded by philosophic theosophists." See Grimm, 'Lex. N. T.' s. v. E. Schaubach has written a monograph on the subject, "Comment. quâ exponitur quid *στοιχ. τοῦ κ.* in N. T. sibi valent."

[1] "The whole body which consists of the flesh." (Bp. Lightfoot.)

[2] Cf.—

"And let us choose such *limbs* of noble council,
That the great *body* of our state may go
In equal rank with the best-govern'd nation.'
King Hen. IV. (2nd Part), act. v. sc. 2.

[3] In Romans i. 24, the expression of "their bodies being dis*honoured*" (*ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν*) points to their native glory.

Digitized by Google

instrument of σάρξ, there is some significant qualifying epithet. Rom. viii. 13 stands alone according to the common reading (D, E, F, G; add τῆς σαρκός). But it is qualified by "mortify the deeds of." In 1 Cor. ix. 27, the *body* is not spoken of as a necessary enemy of the Spirit; the spiritual man so disciplines his corporeal nature, that, in the battle against sin it is an ὅπλον δικαιοσύνης (Rom. vi. 13).[1]

vers. 14, 15.

ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ, *fiducialiter* (August.). "Openly" (A.V.) has, however, much to commend it. See ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ, as opposed to ἐν κρυπτῷ, St. John vii. 4, cf. παῤῥησίᾳ, ibid. xi. 44.

θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. (See note on 2 Cor. ii. 14). θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς, "leading us continually in His triumph."

διὰ τ. σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ (Ephes. ii. 16)

τοῖς δόγμασιν according to the first of these interpretations means *precepts* of the N. T., delivered by Christ in indissoluble connection with His *promises*, and substituted for the Mosaic Law. "Contrary to *us*" is spoken by the Apostle in the person of the Jews, for the law was "the minister of *condemnation*" (2 Cor. iii. 9), and involved men in a crushing *debt* (Gal. v. 3). This bond Christ cancelled by His decrees, like a king abolishing by edicts all debts due to the crown. This view is largely supported by Greek commentators (Estius). This is done by Christ's *dogmas* (doctrines—τοῖς τ. πίστεως δόγμασιν, Theophyl.), Hammond. But while δόγματα is certainly used *in bono sensu*, Acts xvi. 4, Hammond's interpretation of ἐν δόγμασιν as signifying Christ's *doctrines*, Ephes. ii. 15, must be pronounced erroneous.

ver. 16.

As to the bearing of this verse (1) on the Lord's Day; (2) on Church festivals. (1) "In N. T. the *Sabbath* is neither *praised* (?) nor commanded; the Lord's Day is mentioned, but not enjoined. Those who are more deeply immersed in worldly business find a distinct day useful and necessary. Those who make life one continual Sabbath have the privilege of a greater liberty" (Bengel). These remarks, however, require modification from our Lord's principle that the Sabbath was *made for man* (St. Mark ii. 27). If so, as it has been well put, "why then should man be deprived of it"? (See Canon Cook's exhaustive sermon, "Sabbath Rest." in 'Church Doctrine and Spiritual Life,' Pp. 76–88; also the admirable discussion in M. Bersier's Sermons, i. pp. 271–301). (2) As to *Church Festivals*, Bp. Davenant remarks (*a*) In Jewish feasts there was a *moral* and a *ceremonial* element: from the latter we are free, but not from the former. (*b*) Specific benefits should be specifically acknowledged. (*c*) Efficacy is given to the great truths of the Gospel by the recurrence of such days. (*d*) The utility of fixing the attention upon particular facts and doctrines. (*e*) The example of the institution of the Purim and Encænia. To which we may, above all, add that in no other way can the *Church*, as such, make such provision for the full preaching of the Gospel, or for moulding minds and hearts after St. Paul's great conception of the following of Christ. See *supra*, v. 12.

ver. 18.

The chief question here is, whether we are to read μὴ ἑώρακεν or ἑώρακεν.

The negative is omitted in A, B, D, ℵ. [Griesb. suspects μή, Lachmann and Lightfoot remove it from the text. Meyer agrees with this view.]

On the other hand, external authority is not unevenly balanced in favour of μή.[3] Reiche gives a powerful argument in its favour, of which this note is mainly a summary.[4]

## GENERAL NOTE on Coloss. ii. 8, *seqq.*

The apostle deals mainly here with a Judaizing *theosophic* system, built up on a form of oriental *philosophy*. This system was tinged with dualism and the pantheistic ideas of Parseeism. God was represented as the sun or light, of which the universe is an emanation. The myths of a cosmogony, which was at the root of Grecian polytheism, were intermingled with this, and it was full of fragments of Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy. Much was said by the hierophants of this system of a double reign of light and darkness, of angels and demons, their origin, hierarchies, power,

---

[1] In Philipp. iii. 21, our translation of τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν is to be regretted. When one, reading this verse to Archbishop Whately upon his deathbed, came to the words "vile body," the Archbishop exclaimed, "St. Paul never said, '*vile body*.' He said, 'body of our humiliation.'"

[2] "Quæ non videt inculcans, aut sicut, quidam codices habete, quæ *videt* inculcans." (Augustin, 'Epist. ep. cxlix. ad Paulin.')

[3] C, D** and ***E, F, and G have οὐκ.

[4] Reiche, 'Comment. Crit.' ii. 275, 290.

Digitized by Google

worship, and mediation. Long before Apostolic times, Judaizing philosophy had worked up ideas from this school, and tried to bring them into the circle of Mosaic thought, (as in the Apocrypha and Philo). Thus they employed two kinds of material—the oriental conception of deliverance from the fatal, essentially evil reign of matter—and the ceremonial precepts of the Jewish Law. From these they constructed a narrow, illiberal, practical code, and enjoined an austere asceticism upon their followers. They encouraged those who shrank from a repulsive discipline, by promising them victory over the flesh, emancipation of the will, and union with God.

St. Paul is dealing with such teachers in this passage. (1) *Orientalizing* philosophy, or (2) *Judaizing* ceremonialism, are constantly in view. (1) For orientalizing philosophy, or theosophy—the *cultus* of genii or angels (ii. 18), their hierarchies (v. 15), their power broken and themselves led in triumph by Christ (v. 15). Christ is contrasted with such spirits throughout. In Him dwells the πλήρωμα of the Godhead (v. 9). He is the Head of the one kingdom, which comprises in its vast compass the whole universe of being. He is the bestower of a renovation of the soul, far beyond circumcision (v. 11), the forgiver of sins (v. 13), the life of the Church's life and growth (v. 19). (2) For Judaizing ceremonialism—see "ordinances" (v. 14) "meats and drinks," annual, monthly, weekly festivals (v. 16), human commandments and traditions (vv. 20–22).

Thus verse 18 warns the Colossians that there is no right in any man to trouble the peace of Christians by declaring that an austerely regulated life of ostentatious humility, and reverence for spiritual beings is necessary to salvation; no right to pronounce those who will not accept such teaching unworthy of the heavenly prize.[1] He who did so was self-assuming and self-authorized, however plausibly he might pretend to abject humility and a worship of affected lowliness paid to angels. It is, of course, precarious to draw confident inferences from doctrines, ideas, and practices, current in the same locality some centuries later. The existence at Colosse of a beautiful and celebrated church, which bore the name of the Archangel Michael, is simply a circumstance which must have been common to Colosse with many other towns.[2] The history of Mont St. Michel shows how far, and to what different soils the seeds of such devotions had been scattered. Still, it is quite worthy of note that in the very district where the first readers of this Epistle lived, the *cultus* of angels prevailed among nominally Catholic Christians in the fourth century, to such an extent as to draw down the condemnation of the Council of Laodicea.[3]

In this strange eclecticism to which St. Paul refers, the angels of the Jews were mixed with the demons of Platonizing philosophy, and the hosts of evil were inextricably confused with the angels of light.

Thus, reading μὴ ἑώρακεν we find all coherent. "Beware of vain, deceitful teachers, passing unrighteous and unwarranted sentences of condemnation to sadden hearts which God has not made sad, by arbitrary ethical decrees, and unsupported dogmatic figments. They profess a profound mystical science, a soaring transcendentalism,[4] a high power of ingress into things which they have not seen, and can never see. They make a haughty attempt to torment you with baseless scruples. Every such teacher is self-willed

---

[1] μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω, v. 18. This word only appears once in Greek, but it is in the golden Greek of Demosthenes (καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπιστάμεθα Στράτωνα ὑπὸ Μειδίου καταβραβευθέντα, καὶ πάντα τὰ δίκαια ἀτιμωθέντα, a. Mid. (Bekker, 21, 93). (Eustathius, however, uses it, commenting upon Iliad, α, 93, 33. (καταβραβεύει αὐτὸν, ὡς φασὶν οἱ παλαιοὶ) in a way which *might* imply that it occurred elsewhere. "Saltem nullibi alias præter apud Demosthenem et Paulum invenitur." (Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.' ii. 279.)

[2] "Colosse, now called Chone (Χῶναι), where is a celebrated church of the Archangel Michael." (Porphyrogen. Thema, i. 3.)

[3] "It is not lawful for Christians to leave the Church of God, and go forth and address angels by name (ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν) and make worshipping assemblies, which things are forbidden. If, therefore, any be found, giving himself up to this secret idolatry, let him be anathema" (Canon 35. Synod. Laod. A.D. 364). On which Zonaras observes: "There was an ancient heresy of some who said that it is not meet to call upon Christ to help, or to give us access to God, but upon the angels." Theodoret writes: "Some said that the God of the universe is Invisible and Incomprehensible, and that it is suitable to work out our reconciliation with God (τὴν θείαν εὐμένειαν πραγματεύειν) through the angels. This feeling continued long in Phrygia and Pisidia, on account of which a Synod at Laodicea in Phrygia forbade by canon the invocation of the angels" (Theod. ad Coloss. ii. 18).

[4] Erasmus thinks that ἐμβατεύειν means "sublimè incedere," like gods and kings in tragedies. The Tragic cothurnus was called ἐμβάς, *i.e.* "A Bœotian shoe, or κόθορνος, the well-known buskin of heroic tragedy, which became its emblem." (See Liddell and Scott, *s. v.*) Budæus and Bp. Davenant suppose that the word signifies "setting forth and entering into things unknown and obscure, as if they were footing it confidently in their own homes."



Digitized by Google

(θέλων ἐν); swollen with arrogance (φυσιούμενος); morally perverse and radically carnal (νόος τῆς σάρκος); affecting a fictitious knowledge of things to man unknown and unknowable, in order to turn souls away from the one Mediator, the opened mystery, and the revelation which makes the way of salvation clear." (1 Tim. i. 7).

If the μή is to be omitted, the apostle must point to visions, spiritual seeing,[1] whether *ironically* (Steiger, Huther) or *seriously* (Meyer).

## CHAPTER III.

1 *He sheweth where we should seek Christ.* 5 *He exhorteth to mortification,* 10 *to put off the old man, and to put on Christ,* 12 *exhorting to charity, humility, and other several duties.*

IF ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

2 Set your [1]affection on things above, not on things on the earth.

3 For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.

4 When Christ, *who is* our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.

5 Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affec-

[1] Or, mind.

1.] As is usual with St. Paul, the second, or practical, part of his epistle now follows. The ethical is founded upon the dogmatical. Upon a basis of doctrine rises the superstructure of practical Christianity.

*If ye then.*] Cf. *if* in ii. 20.

*be risen.*] "Were raised once for all" (St. Paul's baptismal tense—the aor.). Rising from death is expressed in Baptism, and wrought out in each individual life, which is true to its baptismal grace.

*where Christ* **is**—*continually seated.*]

2. *things above.*] Repeated from last verse "Seek the things which are above—nay, not merely **seek** them—*think* them, *mind* them (φρονεῖτε)."

3. *For* **ye died.**] The baptismal tense again.

*your life is hid with Christ in God.*] "Like the spring of that mystical river of the water of life which flows forth from the throne of God and of the Lamb" (A. Knox, Remains, II. 397.) The Christian's life is 'hid' from unbelievers who do not share it; often to a great extent from his fellow-Christians; sometimes in measure from his very self. (See Canon Cook, 'Church Doctrines and Spiritual Life,' pp. 57, 64.)

4. WHEN CHRIST SHALL APPEAR, OUR LIFE.] Thought and language are again *Johannic.* "I am the Resurrection and *the Life,* saith the Lord" (S. John xi. 25. Cf. i. 4; xiv. 6), compared with "Concerning the Word who is also in Life" (1 S. John i. 1—same construction as the Gospel ii. 21; xi. 13). "In winter, the green tree is like the dry. Summer comes, and the living root produces leaves and fruits. So our winter is the concealment of Christ, our summer the manifestation of Christ. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." Yes; dead full surely. But dead in appearance, alive at the roots. But think of the summer-burst which is to follow. "When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear,—Lo! my covenant, dear God! I will die to myself, that Thou mayest live in me." (August. Serm. cxii. in Temp.)

*when Christ shall appear.*] 1 John iii. 2, is scarcely an exact parallel. "When He *shall appear*" (A. V.), should there probably be "When *it* shall have appeared,"—scil. what we shall be. See note in loc.

*Christ.*] Four times over in these four verses.

5. *your* **members** *which are upon the earth; fornication, &c.*] The evil habits here specified are the members. Special habits of sin form limbs of *a body,* with which the inward evil life provides itself. The image of sin as a body underlies the mention of particular sins as members. (See above on ii. 11.)

*fornication, &c., and covetousness, which is idolatry.*] (Note after fornication and three other anarthrous words καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολ.) "Mortify by a decisive act your members which are upon the earth, fornication, &c., and further the covetousness which is one of the class of things (ἥτις) that is practically just equivalent to idolatry." Impurity and covetousness cover nearly the whole field of vice.

[1] ὁρᾶν, in this sense, has generally some word added (cf. ὀπτασίαν ἑώρακεν, St. Luke i. 22; ὀπτ. ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι, ibid. xxiv. 23). One of the supporters of this reading (Junker—quoted by Reiche) understands it of the splendid sight of the consummate perfection of ritual which the Judaizers had seen in the Temple at Jerusalem, and wished to introduce at Colosse and elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

tion, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry:

6 For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:

7 In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them.

8 But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.

9 Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;

10 And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:

11 Where there is neither Greek

---

**6.** *For which things' sake the wrath of God is* **coming.**] (On this grand word, which gives a personality to the advent of God's wrath, see on 1 St. John ii. 18). The short reading, which omits "on the children of disobedience," is supported by B (though not by the mass of MSS.), and received into the text by Tisch. and Bp. Lightfoot; it is also very striking in itself, and quite agrees with the general conciseness of the Epistle to the Colossians.

**7.** *In* **the which.**] A. V. Specially to be thus translated, if the Text. Rec. stands, as referring not to persons, but to the things on which the wrath of God is coming.

*when ye lived in them.*] (See Note at end of chapter.)

**8.** *But as* **it is** (νυνὶ δὲ) *ye also put off* **all**] —Not only those just named. He proceeds to mention sins of quite a different character from those in v. 5.

*anger, wrath.*] "Anger" (ὀργή) the indignation which possibly beginning from little, takes possession of the entire mind. "Wrath" (θυμός) the effervescence which may soon subside. Cf. the *excandescentia* defined by Cicero, 'Tusc.' iv. 9–21.

*malice.*] κακία. The vice of mind opp. to humanity and moderation.

*Evil* **communication.**] The word covers both specifically filthy, and generally *evil* speaking (Bp. Lightfoot). The context here would seem rather to point at grossness of speech, arising from fury or hatred.

**9-10.** *the old man—the new* **man**] (τὸν νέον) the young nature *which is ever being* **renovated** (τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον.) The distinction between (1) νέος, (2) καινός, is worthy of careful notice. (1) is of time. (2) of quality. (1) new, as young. (2) new, as fresh. (1) the *recent*, which *succeeds*. (2) the *novel*, which *supersedes*. Cf. the 'new covenant' (διαθ. καινή (Heb. viii. 8). There is *supersession* involved in the very idea of καινή (ibid. 13).

*Lie not one to another.*] Lying is directly forbidden in the Apostolic Epp. only here, and Ephes. iv. 25. The very infrequency of absolute prohibition shows that truth was an instinct of the new spiritual life. St. John seems to shudder when the word occurs to him. He sees a trace of it in every department of sin (1 S. John i. 10; 2 iv. 2). How eloquent are those words—*and all liars*—in that terrible verse (Apoc. xxi. 8).

*the new man* (τὸν νέον).] Cf. the notion of *young* life in Ephes. iv. 23 (ἀνανεοῦσθαι), and the *renovation* following from it, in the *renovated* man (τὸν καινὸν ἄνθ.) of the next verse. The man who, in point of time and fact, is, so to speak, '*young*,'—called into being later *in time* than the infant born into the world—is perpetually being *renovated* through and through (τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον) in that nature which not only *succeeds* to, but *supersedes*, the nature with which he was born.

("*Paullatim* vetus homo exuitur, novo proficiente.") (Estius.)

There is a threefold *oldness*, and a corresponding threefold *newness* — in the heart, our *thoughts*; in the mouth, our *words*; in the body, our *works*. (St. Bernard, Serm. xxx.)

*in knowledge*] "is **ever being renovated** up towards the standard of **perfect knowledge.**"

*after the image of Him that created him.*] Of *Christ*. Cf. Gen. i. 26, 28; Ephes. iv. 24; and see note on Christ as the image, *supra*, i. 15.

**11.** *Where*] *i.e.*, in the world or society of the new creation implied in the preceding ver.

*there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.*] Cf. Rom. x. 12, and *contrast* with Galat. iii. 28. (Neither (1) Jew nor Greek, (2) bond nor free, (3) male nor female, (i.e. neither (1) *religious* prerogative, (2) nor *social* caste, (3) nor *natural* distinction.) The special circumstances here lead to a different arrangement: (1) "Greek and Jew"—a ref. to *Judaizing teachers*, who laid stress upon circumcision. Hence (2) "circumcision and uncircumcision."



Digitized by Google

nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond *nor* free: but Christ *is* all, and in all.

12 Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering;

13 Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a [1]quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also *do* ye.

[1] Or, complaint

14 And above all these things *put on* charity, which is the bond of perfectness.

---

(3) "Barbarian, Scythian." The Greeks did not consider Barbarians worthy of a community in their name. But among Barbarians the Scythians had a pre-eminence of degradation. The Apostle's thought is, that be men ever so much Barbarian—aye, such as the very Scythians—they are still capable of renovation. There is here a reference to Gnosticism, which was met by pointing out that the Gospel was offered not only to Barbarians generally, but to those of the lowest caste, who were regarded in the ancient world as Papuans or Andaman Islanders may be among ourselves. Some modern thinkers hold that habitual criminals are a peculiar race with atavistic inherited peculiarities. If they are such, they are yet in a world where this, like every other distinction of race, is done away. (4) "Bond, free"—master and slave was a relation of special importance at Colosse. "Not till that word *Barbarian* was struck out of the dictionary of mankind, and replaced by *brother*, can we look even for the first beginnings of our science. This change was effected by Christianity. . . . *Humanity* is a word which you look for in vain in Plato or Aristotle; the idea of mankind as one family, as the children of one God, is an idea of Christian growth. . . . When people had been taught to look upon all men as brethren, then, and then only, did the variety of human speech present itself as a problem that called for a solution in the eyes of thoughtful observers; and I therefore date the real beginning of the science of language from the day of Pentecost." (Prof. Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 1st series, p. 118, quoted by Bp. Lightfoot.) It will, however, be observed that the *Apostle* is speaking not directly of man's common capacity of *intellectual culture*, but of his common capacity of *spiritual renovation*. This is exactly the tone of the Psalmist in that wonderful miniature of the regeneration of the world, with its threefold assertion of the *new birth* of the individuals who make up nations into the city of God. ("This man was born there." "A man and a man were born in her." "This man was born there." Ps. lxxxvii. 4, 5, 6.)

*But* **all and in all is Christ.**] "Christ vivifies the whole sphere of human life, and permeates all its developments." (Bp. Lightfoot.) The word *Christ* stands with great emphasis last. In our less glowing language, we might say *Christianity*; but St. Paul, with his intense realization of Christ as a living person, says *Christ*—Everything in the renovated creation is Christ, and Christ is in all.

**12-18.** "Therefore, as a people endued with three great gifts of God—elect, consecrated, beloved — clothe and array yourself with tender and truly human emotions of compassion, with goodness to others, humility in your own mind, gentleness, long-suffering—forbearing one another, and forgiving each his fellow-partaker in the body of Christ, if any happen to have cause of complaint against any. Even as the Lord forgave you all by that one great redeeming act, so also do ye. And above and over all these clothe and array yourselves with that love, which, taken in all its glorious entireness," (such is the force of the neuter ὅ in v. 14,) "is the enclasping garment, which holds together the various parts that make up the fair completeness of the Christian life. And let the peace of *Christ* rule in your hearts, to which also ye were once for all called in one Body—and be ye thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly. In all wisdom teaching and admonishing each other mutually in psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, gracefully and sweetly singing with full heart to the Lord. And all universally, whatsoever ye may do in word or deed, all things do in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him."

**12.** *elect, holy, beloved.*] He appeals to them by three primary attributes of those who are called into the Christian Church.

*put on bowels of mercies.*] Cf. St. Luke i. 78. "Clothe yourselves with deep inwardly felt human emotions of"

*kindness, humbleness of mind.*] The first manifestly to others, the second in the recesses of our own soul.

**13.** *Forbearing one another, and forgiving each* **the other.**] (1) ἀλλήλων, (2) ἑαυτῶν. The second reciprocal pronoun emphasizes corporate unity more than the first (Bp. Lightfoot).

*have a quarrel.*] Matter of complaint.

**14.** *above all these things put on charity.*]

Digitized by Google

15 And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful.

16 Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs,

---

**And over all these things put on** (Hammond)—"put on" understood (as in A. V.) from v. 12. Over and above all these, array ye yourselves with love—"Love is the outer garment which holds the others in their places, the power which unites together all the graces which make up perfection" (Bp. Lightfoot). For the idea of a grace or virtue being the connecting link to loop together all the rest, commentators well quote, "Admirabili facilitate virtutum incredibilium, *quæ specie dispares prudentiâ conjunguntur*." (Cic. ad M. Brutum, Orat. ix.)

*which.*] Note the universalizing sing. neut. (τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ)—love, which *thing universally*. Possibly, however, the neuter may refer to the *act* of putting on love.

*the bond of perfectness.*] The thought is that all Christian graces are collected and clasped by love, and fall asunder without it. (Corn. à Lap.)

**15.** *the peace of God.*] The beautiful reading **Peace of Christ** has the preponderance of uncial MSS. (see especially B ℵ). It is adopted by Lachm., Tischend., Bp. Lightfoot, and recognised in the oldest versions. (*Pax Christi*, Cod. Amiat.) The context is also in its favour. The question surely is not of *God's peace* with *man*, which is purely His gift, and which men could not be very appropriately enjoined to have, inasmuch as it is His gift. The point is rather that peace which faithful Christians should keep one to another, and allow to rule in their hearts. St. Paul is not so much wishing for the peace of God to keep them, as enjoining them to *keep* the peace of Christ—The peace thus enjoined is emphatically the peace of *Christ*, commanded by His precept (cf. "the word of Christ," v. 16). See St. John xiv. 27, &c.

*rule.*] Βραβευέτω. "Be the *moderator* and guide in your hearts" is Hammond's paraphrase. On the whole, however, the "rule" of the A. V. is probably most simple and correct. Βραβεύω is no doubt, most lit. "to be umpire, or arbiter, as in gymnastic games," and hence decider of contests and differences (see lexicog. for instances of its application to wars, lawsuits, and arguments). But, as often, the metaph. was rubbed away in the friction of daily use, and the word came simply to mean "to dispose, administer, rule." The older Greek commentators (Chrysost., Theodor.) naturally made much of the metaphor of *umpire*. But St. Paul is scarcely speaking so much of *that* (or of *victory*, Erasm., Calvin), as simply of the duty of a Christian man to allow peace to prevail in his heart.

It may be remarked that in another Epistle of the Roman captivity, the Apostle uses an uncommon word to denote the office of peace (φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας, Philipp. iv. 7). This may add some strength to the argument for retaining the metaphorical sense in the passage before us.

**16.** *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly.*] It has been said that there is no direct reference here to any definite body of truths, written or oral. The word, of course, was not yet written. and the reference cannot be to "the word" in the sense of the volume of the N. T. But surely "the word of Christ," graven on Apostolic hearts and preached by Apostolic lips, was a very definite body of truths indeed. Few passages are more deflected from their exact meaning in the context in ordinary practical preaching than this. The "indwelling in you" does not at all point to the fruitful improvement of knowledge by each individual who received the word of Christ. *That* is not the question here. St. Paul is touching upon *public worship* and its uses—a natural sequence of the reign of peace of which he had spoken. "Let the word of Christ **inhabit among** you richly." That word, like charity, might begin at home, but it was not to end there. It was to make a dwelling "among them." True—but it was to do so *richly*. It was to be propagated and expanded. This was an idea especially brought out by common public worship, with its means of mutual edification, especially with its chants and hymns (Cf. 1 Corinth. xiv. 1, *seqq.*; Ephes. v. 19.) All this, too, reacted upon the preservation of that peace of which he had just spoken.

*richly in all wisdom; teaching, &c.*] The words are probably best connected as in A. V.

*teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, &c.*] It may seem, at first sight, somewhat singular that wisdom and edification should be predicated of metrical effusions rather than of prose. But the hymns of the primitive Church were largely dogmatic and didactic.

*in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.*] I. For the construction of the words. The three datives are not to be joined with the participle "singing" ("singing *in*" or "*by*

Digitized by Google

singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.

17 And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, *do* all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.

18 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.

19 Husbands, love *your* wives, and be not bitter against them.

20 Children, obey *your* parents in

---

psalms" for (ᾄδειν seems to be never thus used with a dative) &c.,—but with what *precedes*—"in all wisdom, teaching, &c., one another *by*," or "*in* psalms, hymns, spiritual songs." II. For the distinction between these three words. (1) "Psalms," the inspired Psalter of the Hebrew canon. (2) "Hymns," the expression of the new salvation uttering itself in a new song. According to St. Augustine, the Hymn requires *three* conditions —it must be *sung*, it must be to *God*, and it must be *praise*. (3) ᾠδή is the only word of the group found in the Apoc. (v. 9; xiv. 3; xv. 3) "wider range of poetic utterance than direct address to the Deity"—such, e. gr. as the poems in Herbert's 'Temple,' or Keble's 'Christian Year.' (See the masterly discussion in Archb. Trench's 'Synonyms of N. T.,' p. 287.)

*singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.*] "*Gracefully* singing with **heartfelt devotion to the Lord.**" (See Note at end of chapter in defence of the rendering.) Phrygia was proverbially a land of music. A music of wild excitement was used in the worship of Cybele, and of Salazion, the Phrygian Dionysos. (Strabo, x. 479.) Hence St. Paul might be the more anxious that Christian singing should be sweet and graceful in a Phrygian Church. For a deep feeling of anxiety on the part of a ruler in the ancient Church that sacred song should be beautiful, see the story how Ignatius brought back the melody of angels heard in vision to his Church at Antioch. (Socrates, Hist. vi. 8). Heartfelt singing is not *voiceless* singing. An old commentator pithily observes, "We never read that any one sang without voice;" and pertinently points to Psalm cxi. 1, "I will praise the Lord with my whole heart, in the assembly of the upright, and in the congregation." The Psalmist's praise was in his heart (ἐν καρδίᾳ μου—LXX), but it must have been vocal also, for it was such praise as is offered in the "assembly" and "congregation." Therefore we must understand here in *the heart* as from *the heart*, sc. that we are to sing not only "with the mouth but with the heart." (Pelag. apud S. Hieron. opp. XI. 900.)

*to the Lord.*] The balance of authority in uncials is against the Text. Rec. and in favour of "to God." This reading is accepted by Tischendorf and Bp. Lightfoot.) But the whole passage shows that the apostle had Christ distinctly in view. From iii. 12 to iv. 1, *Christ* is all and everywhere—*Christ's* forgiveness, iii. 13; *Christ's* peace, v. 15; *Christ's* word, v. 16; *Christ's* name, v. 17 (cf. vv. 18, 20, 22, 23; iv. 1, where the word "Lord" occurs *eight* times). We naturally think of Pliny's often quoted words ("stato die ante lucem conveniunt, *carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere solent.*") Cf. Tertull. 'Apolog.' 2. An anonymous writer (about A.D. 200) speaks of "such psalms and hymns, written by faithful brethren from the beginning, as hymn the word of God, the Christ, proclaiming Him God" (τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες). Apud Euseb. 'H. E.' v. 28.

**17.**] Another instance of St. Paul's way of *rising* from particular duties to general principles:—as St. James, on the contrary, *descends* from general axioms to particular duties.

*through Him.*] This comes in, with much emphasis, at the close of this paragraph. Through *Christ*, not—as the Colossians were tempted to do—through *angels* (Bengel). It is only just to quote the explicit statement of Estius. "In this place St. Paul peculiarly expresses the medium through which,—"in the name of the Lord Jesus—*through Him*"—because, as Chrysost. and Theophyl. note, he is writing against those who introduce angels as mediators and saviours instead of Christ."

**18,** *seqq.*] *All* is to be done in the name of the Lord Jesus. (See the eloquent passage in Chrysost.) This forms a natural point of transition to the details of every-day life. It is part of St. Paul's practical teaching that the Divine order, introduced into the world by Christ, lays the strong grasp of its purity upon all the inter-relations of the family and the household. The apostle here might almost be supposed to have in his mind the "three great pairs of mutual relation, of which family life is constructed," as given by Arist.—husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant. These are "the three bonds out of which family life is organized." Arist. Polit. i. 3.

*your own husbands.*] Rather, "**your husbands.**"

AS IT IS FIT IN THE LORD.] "It is fit," ἀνῆκεν. A peculiarly Gentile word for that which is morally becoming (ἀνῆκον πρέπον (Suidas).

Digitized by Google

all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord.

21 Fathers, provoke not your children *to anger*, lest they be discouraged.

22 Servants, obey in all things *your* masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God:

23 And whatsoever ye do, do *it* heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men;

24 Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.

25 But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.

---

The word occurs in the N. T. only in the Epistles of the captivity. Cf. Ephes. v. 4; Philem. v. 8. It may have been suggested by intercourse with *Gentiles*. The Ap. in adopting it places it within the Gospel circle by two words (ἐν κυρίῳ).

**19.** *be not bitter against them.*] "Work not yourselves up to bitterness in your feelings or relations towards them." St. Paul's teaching is to suppress the bitterness in the very workings of the heart, and to change it into sweetness.

**20.** *Children, obey your parents in all things.*] St. Paul is not a casuist in the modern sense. He does not stop to reconcile those conflicts of apparently inconsistent duties, which occur everywhere from time to time, and must often be painfully felt in a community essentially heathen, which supplies the Church with converts out of isolated families. He would give no handle for such teaching as that which was so sternly condemned by our Lord (St. Matt. xv. 3-6).

**21.** *provoke not your children to anger*] The practical wisdom and keen observation of St. Paul are evinced by this verse. There is apt to be an element of sinfulness and self-pleasing in, perhaps, all human punishments, even in those of parents ("They chastened us after *their own pleasure*"—Heb. xii. 10). Fitful severity, or over-severity, on the part of parents, is apt to begin by arousing bursts of *temper* (ἐρεθίζετε) which pass away, and end by utterly breaking the spirit, and leaving a mood of utter flaccidity and discouragement (ἀθυμῶσιν). ("Fractus animus pestis juventutis."—Bengel.)

**22. Ye slaves.** There is here a larger development of the duties of *slaves* than of any other class. This prominence may well be accounted for by the incident of Onesimus, which must have been much in St. Paul's thoughts just now. (Cf. Ephes. vi. 5-9.

*not with eye-service.*] Rather in plural, **eye-services** (ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν). The reading is much more *difficult*, and, therefore, more likely to be genuine. It very aptly describes a slave's *repeated* acts, a long *series* of deceitful and imperfect services. The word is probably of St. Paul's own coinage, being found only here and Ephes. vi. 6. It would signify that the Christian slaves should perform their tasks, not only when their masters were present and looking on, but when they were absent. (So Theophyl. ad Ephes. vi. 6.)

*singleness of heart.*] An *undivided* heart.

**23, 24.**] *do it as to the Lord. . . . knowing that of* **a Lord** (ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ . . . ὅτι ἀπὸ κυρίου).

**25.**] The Gospel, with all its message of hope and forgiveness, its invitation and promises to repentance, does not repeal the eternal law of right and wrong. *Both master* and *slave* are included in St. Paul's solemn warning—the latter, no doubt, especially. St. Paul was made sensitive by the conduct of Onesimus.

*there is no respect of persons.*] "Justice has a double edge. There must be a *reciprocity* between the master and slave. The philosophers of Greece taught, and the laws of Rome assumed, that the slave was a chattel. But a chattel could have no rights. It would be absurd to talk of treating a chattel with justice. St. Paul places their relations in a totally different light. Justice and equity are the expression of the Divine mind; and with God there is no respect of persons. With Him the claims of the slave are as real as the claims of the master." Προσωποληψία, respect of persons, might, in certain cases, be on the side of the poor and oppressed. (Levit. xix. 15, LXX.) There would be a tendency in the mind of the *slave* to assume that, because the προσωπολ. of men was on the side of the master, there must be a corresponding προσωπολ. of God on the side of the slave. This assumption is corrected by St. Paul." (Bp. Lightfoot, pp. 229, 230.) A striking instance of such a προσωποληψία even in a trained legal mind may be found in the manifest inclination of the Lord Chief Justice against Falstaff (*King Henry IV.*, 2nd Part, Act II., Scene 1.)

Digitized by Google

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on vv. 7, 13, 16, 19.

**7.** A.V. Several MSS (A, B, C, D, E, א), followed by Lachm., Tisch., Bp. Lightfoot, read "in **these things**" (ἐν τούτοις). The Text. Rec. has, however, some external authority. "No reason appears why the apostle, speaking in both members of the verse of the same thing, should use in one the *relative;* and in the other (in which something similar is predicated of the same subject) should *not* use the personal pronoun (ἐν αὐτοῖς) but the demonstrative (ἐν τούτοις).

**13.** *even as Christ.*] Lachmann, Meyer, Bp. Lightfoot, read *Lord* (κύριος). But the readings of the uncial MSS. are nearly evenly balanced. There seems no sufficient reason for departing from the Text. Recept. So Tischend.[1]

**16.** It is of considerable importance to establish this interpretation.

The three conditions of Church singing and of sacred song are *sweetness* of *vocal expression; fulness* of *inward devotion; direction* to a divine object. These three conditions are compressed into this clause. (1) As to *outward expression*—"gracefully, sweetly, so as to give pleasure and be attractive." (ἐν χάριτι). (2) As to *inward devotion*—"heartfelt" (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν). (3) As *to* the *Being addressed*—"to the Lord" (τῷ κυρίῳ).

The clue to the real meaning of the passage, as well as to the subtle perplexity of readings here, is to bear articulately in mind that the apostle is speaking, not at all of personal or domestic, but altogether of public and ecclesiastical singing, as a *Church duty*, a part of the Church's corporate life, a declaration of the peace among her children, and a means of edification. The words translated "singing with grace" (ἐν χάριτι ᾄδοντες) really mean "gracefully." (χαριέντως).[2]

They refer, as they so often do, to beauty, gracefulness, acceptableness, as in the case of things or persons, especially words, sayings, verses, by which we are pleased. The word ᾄδειν always denotes that which is *vocal* and *audible*, and ἐν χ. ᾄδ. most naturally means that which can win, touch, and please susceptible ears.[3]

The chief argument *against* this view is that ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις (if that be the right reading) *probably* must—ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (if that reading be accepted) *possibly*[4] may mean songs of "worship mainly of the silent kind." (Huth. Meyer). But it is surely reasonable to understand the phrase as meaning not only with the lips, but with heart and soul. Cf. Ephes. v. 19, where καὶ ψάλλοντες is joined with ᾄδοντες, and cannot without violence be understood merely of the *inward*.

This recognition of sweetness and pleasingness, as an element to be aimed at in public worship, is very interesting and important. Such care for singing, again, is quite of a piece with St. Paul's high ideal of womanly grace and beauty in youth (1 Cor. xi. 15), priest-like dignity in age (Titus ii. 3); with his recognition of things "lovely" (Phil. iv. 3); with his appeal to primary æsthetic instincts (1 Cor. xi. 13); with his horror of "confusion" in public worship (ibid. xiv. 33); with the word for a grave and majestic beauty in public service, expressed in that great foundation-rubric, εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν,

---

[1] א has ὁ Θεός, God.

[2] The first meaning of χάρις is that which brings with it joy, pleasure, attractiveness; first and specially of *words* (Eccles. x. 12; Sirac xxi. 16; St. Luke iv. 22; Ephes. iv. 29; Coloss. iv. 6); but also "id quod delectat in homine vel re." Prov. i. 9; Ps. xlv. 3 (see Bretschn. Lex. Man. 441; Grimm, Clav. N. T. 455).

[3] If the high authority of Bp. Lightfoot is against this view, it should be remembered (1) that he reads here ἐν τῇ χάριτι; (2) that in iv. 5 he explains thus: "Let your speech be always ἐν χ. with *grace, favour*, i.e. acceptableness, pleasingness." It is, of course, plain that if the reading be ἐν τῇ χ. the words must mean "*grace.*" The balance of uncial MSS. is against the anarthrous χάριτι. Still, besides the bearing of the context, the Text. Rec. has for it A C א. Chrysost. Damasc. Theophylact. Œcum.

[4] ἐν ταῖς κ. has most MSS., but the Fathers generally cite the singular. Reiche here says, "I rather believe that St. Paul wrote ἐν τῇ κ., as in Eph. v. 19. It suits his purpose better. The formula ἐν τῇ κ. (Hellenist. from בלבב) has the only sense which is here appropriate, viz. *ex animo*, with full assent of heart. By this addition his readers are warned, in public Church singing, to join not only with sweet and tunable voice (ἐν χάριτι), but with pure emotion of heart. But with the reading ἐν ταῖς κ. we are almost necessarily driven to think of silent, solitary singing, or mental recitation so to speak, unheard by human ears (so Bähr, Huth., Meyer). But ᾄδειν is never so used. The whole particip. prop. is so coherent as to point clearly to *mutual edification*, which could only be effected by audible chants or modulated recitation which others could hear. In the whole passage everything tends to show that St. Paul was not thinking of this private kind of singing, but altogether of that common sacred song by which they could naturally edify each other, so that the doctrine of Christ might fix its dwelling-place more and more among them (ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν)." See Reiche, Com. Crit. ii. 299, 311, for a full dissertation on the passage.

Digitized by Google

ibid. 40). It illustrates St. Paul's way of carrying out his own precept that Christians ought to know how to answer *each single man* (iv. 6). It shows how thoughtfully he considered local circumstances, and adapted his lessons to them. Phrygia was a land of music. But its music was apt to become the accompaniment of the passionate and unmanly wailing of Asian barbarism.[1] It had been moulded from its very first existence from the fanatical excitement of the frenzied services of Cybele and Dionysus.[2] It may be added that this interpretation has specially commended itself to many with whom it scarcely might have been expected to find favour.[3]

19. *μὴ πικραίνεσθε.* The middle is used like Niph. or Hithp. in Hebrew to describe the working of the inner affections (*πάθη*).

---

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *He exhorteth them to be fervent in prayer,* 5 *to walk wisely toward them that are not yet come to the true knowledge of Christ.* 10 *He saluteth them, and wisheth them all prosperity.*

MASTERS, give unto *your* servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.

2 Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving;

3 Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds;

4 That I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.

5 Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.

---

1. *give unto your* **slaves.**] "Exhibit on your parts" (Bp. Lightfoot).

2. *watch.*] Prayer is a *work*, demanding thought, care, and preparation. "Words without thoughts never to heaven go."

3. *A door of utterance.*] "A door for the **word**" to pass through; cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12. In the rush and press of thought, the fettered Gospel seems to be almost identified with the fettered Apostle. (See δέδεμαι at the end of the verse.) "The word" is a captive with him. They are to pray that God would open before him a door, that the imprisoned word may pass through, and speed onward. (Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 1.)

5. *them that are without.*] The technical term for persons outside the pale of the Church (1 Cor. v. 12, 13)—see Schöttgen on 1 Cor. v. 12.

*redeeming the time.*] "Buying up the **opportunity.**" A metaphor taken from mercantile life. "Eagerly purchasing, as it were, each golden opportunity for helping forward the cause of Christ." (*καιρὸν*, not *χρόνον*.)

6. *Let your speech be alway with grace.*] *ἐν χάριτι* (rather *pleasing*, acceptable, *χαριέντως*, as supra, iii. 16.)

*seasoned with salt.*] Neither insipid commonplace, nor corrupt pleasantry. The Apostle is not speaking of *Attic*, but of *sacrificial* salt; not of *wit*, but of *sanctity*. He refers to the injunction of the law—"with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt" (Levit. ii. 13). "Let all your conversation be, as it were, conformed to that injunction. Let it be an oblation to God, seasoned with the spiritual salt which He requires." The first element in the idea is the percolation of speech by the holy, purifying, self-sacrificing influence of the Spirit. The interpretation given by our Lord to the symbol of salt had passed into the vocabulary of Christians. (Cf. St. Matt. v. 13; St. Mark ix. 49, 50; St. Luke xiv. 34.) The consequence of this will, no doubt, be that it will have those secondary qualities generally understood by

---

[1] *Φρυγίοις ἔτυχον Φρυγίοισι νόμοις—*
*βαρβάροις νόμοισι.*
Eurip. Orest. 1426–1430.
*βάρβαροις λέγουσιν αἰαῖ*
*'Ασιάδι φωνῇ.*—*Ibid.* 1395.

[2] *ὁ Πρόκλος φησὶ τὴν μὲν Δώρεα ἁρμονίαν εἰς παιδείαν ἐξαρκεῖν ὡς καταστηματικὴν* (temperate, restrained) *τὴν δὲ Φρύγιον εἰς ἱερὰ καὶ ἐνθεασμοὺς ὡς ἐκσστατικὴν* ("The Phrygian strain was adapted for sacred rites and fanatical excitements, being of almost frenzied wildness").—*Scholia. in Plat. Rep.* iii. (399A, edit. Stalb.).

[3] "Pro dexteritate quæ grata sit, et suâ utilitate placeat authoribus" (Calvin). "Mit geistlichen, lieblichen Lieden" (Luther). "*Εὐσχημόνως*, sine confusione" (Melanchth.). So Beza. The shade of meaning given by Estius is peculiar, "cum *voluptate spirituali*, sc. eorum qui audiunt" (ii. 683). On the whole, it may be said that the *æsthetic* interpretation is mainly supported by critics of *anti-æsthetic* communions. Among ancient writers, its chief supporter seems to be Theophylact.

Digitized by Google

6 Let your speech *be* alway with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.

7 All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, *who is* a beloved brother, and a faithful minister and fellowservant in the Lord:

8 Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and comfort your hearts;

9 With Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is *one* of you. They shall make known unto you all things which *are done* here.

10 Aristarchus my fellowprisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas, (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him;)

11 And Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only *are my* fellowworkers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me.

12 Epaphras, who is *one* of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always [1]labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and [1]complete in all the will of God.

13 For I bear him record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them *that are* in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis.

[1] Or, *striving.*

[1] Or, *filled.*

---

salt—that it will be wise and pungent, pure and pleasant. It was finely said by Mr. Robert Hall of a friend—"he was witty; but his sallies never cost a saint a sigh, or a virgin a blush." For duties of *speech*, and their importance, cf. St. James i. 26.

*how ye ought to answer every man.*] **Each single man** (ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ). Their speech is not to be vague and declamatory, but to be appropriate to the individuals to whom it is addressed, to their wants and feelings. "In one way to Pagans, in another to Jews, in another to heretics." (Pelag. ap. Hieron. XI. 901.) And with similar variety and fitness in every other relation. (See Chrysostom's admirably wise expansion of this text.)

7, 8, 9. *Tychicus . . . whom I have sent* (epistolary aorist) *unto you.*] Tychicus, a native of pro-consular Asia, possibly of Ephesus (Acts xx. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 12). He is associated with St. Paul on three different occasions, (1) at close of 3rd missionary journey, A.D. 58 (Acts xx. 4); (2) at the time when this Epistle was written, A.D. 62, 63; (3) towards the close of St. Paul's life (about A.D. 67). (2 Tim. iv. 12; Titus iii. 12.) (From Bp. Lightfoot, pp. 233, 234.)

With regard to sending letters, it will be borne in mind that, under the Roman empire, there were no postal establishments for carrying private letters with regularity. (M. Renan refers to Cic. 'ad Fam.' iii. 9, xv. 17, xv. 5, 21; 'ad Att.' i. 5, iii. 7; Plin. 'Epist.' ii. 12, viii. 3, ix. 28; Senec. 'Epist.' L.; also to Forcellini, under the word *tabellarius*, and to Naudet, 'Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.' T. xxii. part 2, pp. 166 *seqq.* Renan, 'St. Paul,' p. 228, note 3.) Everything of the kind was done, as an occasional opportunity presented itself, or by express. St. Paul was thus obliged, in his superintendence of the churches, to bring with him persons who discharged the duties of couriers. A system of correspondence existed, at the time, between the Jewish synagogues; they had a special official whose duty it was to superintend this correspondence.

9. *Tychicus with Onesimus.*] "The two names occur in proximity in some Phrygian inscriptions." (Bp. Lightfoot.)

The *recommendation* of Onesimus (v. 9) is very tender and thoughtful. It would be much needed in such a case.

10. 11. On Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, see Introd.

*Marcus the* **cousin** *of Barnabas.*] Certainly not 'nephew' as in A. V. This was the later usage of Byzantine law. The notice here throws light upon Acts xv. 37, and gives a natural explanation of Barnabas' partiality for Mark. There is something very pleasing in the strikingly kind tone towards Mark of this passage and of 2 Timothy iv. 11. "In the year 62 Mark, the near relative of Barnabas, and companion of his journey, was again in the society of Paul (Coloss. iv. 10); hence we may infer that at that date Barnabas was dead. The same inference may be drawn from 1 Peter v. 13, and 2 Tim. iv. 11. Alexander, a monk of Cyprus (of the 6th or 9th century), in a panegyric upon Barnabas, assigns his martyrdom to a date somewhere between the years 53–57" (Hefele, 'Proleg. Epist. St. Barn.' viii.; cf. 'Das Sendschreiben des Apost. Barnabas,' pp. 231 *seqq.*, and 159).

*touching whom ye received commandments* (to this effect, viz.): *if he come unto you, receive him.*] Theodoret maintains from this that St. Paul was personally known to the Colos-

Digitized by Google

14 Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you.

15 Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house.

16 And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea.

17 And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.

18 The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace *be* with you. Amen.

---

sians. "This proves that he had seen them. After the direction concerning Mark (Acts xv. 39) he bore the word to Phrygia. Probably, therefore, he then gave these commandments about Mark." Chrysostom suggests that they may have received the directions from Barnabas. See Theodore of Mopsuestia, vol. i. 308, 309 (edit. Swete).

*who are from the circumcision.*] οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς) Hebrew Christians, converts from Judaism.

*which have been.*] οἵτινες, persons of a *class who*—being *such as have been.*

**12.** Epaphras who is one of you, (ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν) *i.e.* belonging to Colosse. "Whatever service may have been rendered at Colosse by Philemon, or by Nymphas at Laodicea, it was to Epaphras especially that all three cities were indebted for their knowledge of the Gospel. Though he was a Colossian by birth, the fervency of his prayers and the emergency of his love are represented as extending equally to Laodicea and Hierapolis. It is obvious that he looked upon himself as responsible for the spiritual well-being of all alike." (Bp. Lightfoot, p. 31.)

*complete*] or fully **persuaded.**

**13.** *a great zeal.*] Probably "great **labour**" (πόνον with A B C D ℵ. So Tischend., Bp. Lightfoot).

*them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis.*] "The two towns are so close that we may well suppose that the same Epistle served for both. St. Paul joins them in v. 13. In v. 16, indeed, only Laodicea is mentioned; but that is because Laodicea is a little nearer to Colosse than Hierapolis is." (Renan, 'L'Antechrist,' p. 91.)

**14.** *Luke, the beloved physician.*] **Luke the physician**, the **beloved.** It is interesting to observe that the two Evangelists, Mark (v. 10, *supra*) and Luke, are mentioned in the context, as well as in Philem. v. 24. (Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 11. See Introd. to St. Luke's Gospel.)

*Demas.*] 2 Tim. iv. 10; Philem. v. 24, perhaps Demetrius. Is the curt mention of Demas here, contrasted with the full affectionate recognition of St. Luke, the cloud no bigger than a man's hand which prepares us for the subsequent darkness that hangs over this man? (2 Tim. iv. 10.)

**15.** *the church which is in his house.*] **Or** "*their* house," (αὐτῶν). "There is no clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship within the limits of the Roman empire before the 3rd century—though apartments in private houses might be specially devoted to that purpose" (Bp. Lightfoot). But see in opp. Bingham, 'Antiqq.' viii. 1, 13. Is there not a significant antithesis between a private "house" and "the Church" in 1 Cor. xi. 22?—cf. Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Philem. v. 2; Acts xii. 12. "A domestic church. Every head of a family fills an *ecclesiastical*, and, in some sense, *episcopal* office" (Estius).

**16.** *and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.*] "Be sure that ye also read the letter which I have sent to Laodicea, and which ye will get from them." (Bp. Lightfoot. See his elaborate and masterly discussion of the controversy on the epistle from Laodicea, pp. 274–300.) "Churches very near to each other were advised to communicate their letters reciprocally, and to read them in the congregation by turns" (Renan, 'Saint Paul'). Marcion (circ. A.D. 150) considered that the Epistle to the Ephesians of our canon was the Epistle to the Laodiceans here mentioned. (Tertull. 'c. Marcion.' v. 11–17, but see Epiphan. 'Hæres.' xxii. 9, and Canon. Murator., lines 62–67.) That this view is probably to be accepted, see Introd. and Bishop Lightfoot, P. 37, and pp. 274 *seqq.* On the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans, a mere cento of Pauline phrases, see ibid. pp. 281 *seqq.*, 299; with an ingenious attempt at the restoration of the original Greek, pp. 293, 294, and the eccentric defences of it by the Lutheran Prætorius and the Jesuit Stapleton, in spite of the sweeping condemnation of St. Jerome, *ab omnibus exploditur.* ('De Vir. Illust.' 5.)

**17.** *And say to Archippus.*] "Say **ye**," with an idea of immediate and downright saying (εἴπατε). It was a more effective way to send the message through others than to address it in a direct form. It may have been also advanced age, or declining health, which hin-



Digitized by Google

dered Archippus from ministerial activity, though we may be led to suspect some of that lukewarmness with which our Lord Himself charged the Laodicean church in the immediate vicinity of Colosse (Apoc. iii. 16).

*which thou hast received.*] The word "received," favours the inference that the ministry of Archippus—though having its sphere in Christ, "in the Lord"—was yet of regular succession, not of immediate inspiration (cf. παρέλαβες with 1 Cor. xi. 23). The word signifies "traditum accipio" of office; "mente accipio" of oral teaching.

*that thou fulfil it.*] This has often been interpreted as a hint that his ministry was drawing to its close. It has reference probably rather to "due and full performance of it"—"bene perfungi." (Grotius.)

18. *The salutation by the hand of me Paul.*] "The **salutation** of **this letter** is signed by **my own hand**," to which was added, in his own writing, in the genitive, Παύλου, "of **Paul**." St. Paul, as is well known, did not write his Epistles with his own hand: he dictated (Rom. xvi. 22). The words in Philemon (" I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay," v. 19) surely need not imply that the whole Epistle, or any more than the eight Greek words (or possibly only *two*, ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω) were in St. Paul's handwriting. The paragraph in Galat. vi. 11, leads to the same inference. The formal salutation only was his autograph. (2 Thess. iii. 17). The passionate religious controversies of the time, the decisive weight given in the Church to Apostolic authority, and the imperfect conditions of epistolary writing, easily gave occasion to forgeries. (2 Thess. ii. 2; Dion. Cor. apud Euseb. 'H. E.' iv. 23). It has been conjectured that St. Paul sent round a specimen of his handwriting with his Epistles, easily recognised from its large, rough, impetuous formation of letters. (πηλίκοις γράμμασιν, Galat. vi. 11, *not* "how *long an Epistle*," but "in what *large letters*.") It is certain that it was his habit (according to a very general usage) to write at the end of his letters his name, and probably some other words, as a guarantee of the authenticity of the letter. (2 Thess. iii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Coloss. iv. 18. M. Renan refers to Cic. 'ad Att.' viii. 1; Suetonius, 'Tib.' 21, 32; Dion Cass. lviii. 11; Cavedoni, 'Le Salut. delle Epist. di S. Paolo' (Tom. xvii. series 3 of 'Mem. di relig.,' printed at Modena), pp. 12 *seqq.*; 'Saint Paul,' p. 233, note.[4])

*Remember my bonds.*] St. Paul, having dictated the letter and signed his name, added with his own hand these four words—μνημονεύετέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν. He dwells upon his bonds with marked and touching iteration in this chapter. He is no Stoic; he has a sense of injustice and undeserved indignity, and a feeling that his sufferings give him a claim upon those to whom he writes. Three times in this chapter he appeals to his chains (iv. 3, 10, 18). Cf. Ephes. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20; Philem. 9. The words may well imply, in a sort of under-tone, "Be willing, after my example, to suffer in like manner for the truth." (Theodore of Mopsuestia.)

*Grace be with you.*] Such forms of benediction have a tendency to be shortened by the friction of time and use. They are rounded off for the sake of convenience and portability. Cf. the longer form in the earlier Epistles (1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Galat. iii. 8; Rom. xvi. 20 (24); Philipp. iv. 23; and the form with πάντων inserted (Titus iii. 15; Heb. xiii. 25) with this shortened form (Coloss. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22).

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on ver. 17.

Bp. Lightfoot, in a deeply interesting note, shows the possible connection of this warning against drawing back from the work of Christ with that other warning against *lukewarmness* sent through St. John to the angel of the Church of Laodicea. (Apoc. iii. 16). That Divine Epistle would appear to have four points of contact with the Epistle to the Colossians. (1) The special title by which Jesus speaks of Himself as "the *Beginning* of the Creation of God" (Apoc. iii. 14). St. Paul seems to write in the same atmosphere of thought when he says of Christ, "By Him were all things created; all things were created by Him and for Him . . . Who is the *Beginning*" (Coloss. i. 16–18). This great and singular title might well seem to point at the same line of heretical thought in the same locality, and to have a special suitability for those who were carried away by "a religion of angels." (2) The magnificent privilege of "sitting with Christ" (Apoc. iv. 21) has the same tone as Coloss. iii. 1. (3) The warning against *lukewarmness* (Coloss. iv. 17), compared with the burden to Laodicea (Apoc. iii. 19). If Archippus were the Bishop (Angel) of Laodicea, in whom the Church over which he presides is summed up and personified, the connection would be

Digitized by Google

still more remarkable. (4) May we not suppose wealth, *intellectual* as well as literal, to be aimed at in the words, "Thou sayest that I am *rich*"?[1] (πλούσιός εἰμι, Apoc. iii. 17). The passages in Coloss. i. 27, ii. 2, 3 (cf. Ephes. i. 18) might seem to be addressed to persons who thought and spoke much of *wealth*, whether in this metaphorical or in a more literal sense. In this last sense Laodicea was wealthy. After its overthrow by an earthquake, it was rebuilt without help from Rome.[2] See Bp. Lightfoot, pp. 41–44.[1]

18.] Thus the absolute ἡ χάρις in the final benediction may be taken as a *chronological* note. Bp. Lightfoot, who makes the remark, finds another note of the same kind in the exchange of τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις of the earlier Epistles (Thess., Corinth., Galat.) for the ἁγίοις of later Epistles (Rom., Philipp., Coloss., Ephes.).

---

[1] See especially the "*blindness*" (οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι σὺ εἶ . . . τυφλός, ibid.), which answers in the *parallelismus ex oppositione* to the πλούσιος . . . πεπλούτηκα . . . οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω of the first part. The parable of "the rich man who set up greater barns" (St. Luke xii. 16–21) seems to apply with great force to selfish and godless *study*, and to include it as one of the forms of the character of the ὁ . . . μὴ εἰς Θεὸν πλουτῶν (v. 21).

[2] "Nullo à nobis remedio, *propriis opibus* revaluit." Tacit. *Annal.* xiv. 27.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES to the Epistle to the Colossians.

CHAP. I.—15. *The image of the invisible God.*] The note upon this passage simply refers to the use of the word *image*. It would, however, be a grave deficiency to omit all mention of the grand dogmatic significance which has been justly found in it by the greatest theologians of the Church. By no writer, ancient or modern, has this truth been better expressed than by Melanchthon —"The *Image of God.*" When John affirms that "*The Word* was made Flesh," the whole texture of his narrative proves that he speaks not of an evanescent sound, but of a Personal Substantial Existence (ὑφισταμένον). Before the assumption of the Human Nature the Person exists who is called the Word and the Image of God; it is here declared that all things are made and sustained by Him. As the creative Nature is in the Man Christ, it necessarily follows that it cannot be an evanescent sound. But He is called Image of the invisible God, for these reasons:—(1) Had human nature retained its original excellence, it would have been a less dimmed and clouded mirror of the Divine Nature. Yet even in its present darkness some features can still be traced. In the act of thinking, the human mind forthwith paints an *image* of the thing thought. But we cannot transfuse and project our essence into those *images*. They are momentary thoughts, evanescent mental actions. But the Eternal God, in His self-intuition, begets His thought of Himself, which is His own very Image, and that not an evanescent image, but a Personal Existence to which His Essence is communicated. This Image, then, is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, and to Him, as such, *three* great appellations are suitable from this point of view—(a) He is termed the Λόγος, because He is begotten by the Thought of God; (b) He is termed Εἰκών, because thought is *the image of the thing thought;* (c) He is termed Ἀπαύγασμα (Heb. i. 3), that is, splendour issuing or off-raying from light: "Light from Light, as it is in the Creed" (Loci Theol. 'De Filio,' Melanchthon. Opp. i. 152). "More fully, then, He is called Image, because God, in the necessary personality of His perfect self-manifestation, thinking Himself so to speak, by that thought of Himself begets His Image. And, as this substantial Image appears gloriously in the Human Nature of Christ, who perfectly knows the Eternal Father, and is perfectly like God because of the substantial Image shining forth in Him—*Christ* as *God and Man*, is THE IMAGE of the Invisible God. (2) We are to consider that the term 'Image of the Invisible God' is to be understood not only of the transcendent relation of the Son, but of His manifestation to us. (3) Further, this title of Image warns us to distinguish the true God from all false gods and idols. The invisible God proposes to thee His visible Image, and bids thee worship Him as the true God. (4) This Image of God is sent to us, that we may become again, through Him, the image of God (2 Cor. iii. 18)." (Melancnthon. 'Enarr. Epist. ad Coloss.' Opp. iv. 336).

CHAP. IV.—17. The writer desires that the view given in the note upon the message to Archippus should be qualified by subsequent observations in the Introduction to the Epistle of Philemon, and in the note on Philemon (ver. 2).

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# THESSALONIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



### I.

1. WHEN St. Paul first landed upon the continent of Europe (Acts xvi. 11), and had preached at Philippi in Macedonia, he passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, immediately to the south of which lie the snow-clad slopes of Mount Olympus. This city, situated upon the Thermean Gulf, and once the capital of Macedonia, had formerly the name of Therme. Under that name we read of it as one of the camping-places of Xerxes.[1] Cassander enlarged it, and bestowed upon it a new name, in honour of his wife Thessalonica, daughter of Philip, King of Macedon. "As a commercial port," says a recent traveller, "Salonica must always hold a high place, and under a different government must become one of the most important centres of trade in the East, whether one regards its natural advantages as a harbour, or the richness and fertility of the back country, to which it forms the outlet." It was the largest and most populous city of Macedonia, and enjoyed considerable commercial relations.[1] Under the Romans it was

[1] Herod. *Hist.* vii. 21. Thucyd. *de B. Pelop.* i. 61.

[1] Strabo, *Geograph.* i. 7.

Digitized by Google

placed in the division called *Macedonia secunda*, and became the residence of a prætor.[1]

2. Thessalonica was much resorted to by Jews in St. Paul's time.[2] The Apostle seems to have been guided to Thessalonica partly by the fact that it possessed a considerable synagogue, which was frequented from time to time by Hellenic pagans. An opportunity was thus given of proclaiming the Gospel publicly to Gentiles as well as Israelites. St. Paul preached for three weeks, and succeeded in making some converts from the Jews, though he gained many more from the Gentiles—a fact which is reflected in the whole tone and character of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, Among the neophytes were some ladies of rank and position. Nowhere was the hatred of the Jews more savage and malevolent. They hired some of the lowest and most unprincipled of the mob who hung about the streets and markets, and succeeded in raising a furious commotion against St. Paul and his companions. The rioters stormed the house where they lodged. Not finding the missionaries, they dragged the master of the house before the magistrates, asseverating that the preachers of Christ were political conspirators, plotting against the Emperor and the law. These Jews utterly failed in the immediate object which they had in view. But the position of St. Paul was felt by the Thessalonian Christians to be one of extreme peril, and he and Silas left Thessalonica the following night. The Apostle proceeded to Berea. Immediately when the unbelieving Jews of Thessalonica heard of this, they flung themselves upon his track, and constrained him to take his departure. He embarked for Athens.

The whole Epistle leads us to the conclusion that the Gospel found a congenial soil in Thessalonica. Short as had been St. Paul's stay, and broken as were his days by work, he had made an indelible impression. The converts were sorely tried by the restlessness of Jewish malignity. St. Paul yearned in his heart to see them, to console them, to fill up in detail the outlines of the Creed of creeds which they had so deeply understood. This might not be. But he sent his companions back to Berea, with an order for Timothy, who was still in that town, to proceed to Thessalonica for the purpose of comforting the afflicted Church; and then to go on to Athens, bearing with him a full report of the condition of the Church of Thessalonica. (Acts xvii. 15; 1 Thess. iii. 1–5). The tidings which Timothy brought back to St. Paul were to him a very evangel of good news (1 Thess. iii. 6). But St. Paul could not be without anxiety when a spiritual fabric, somewhat hastily reared and compacted, was so rudely assaulted. There were still gaps in the *dogmatic* teaching which he had been able to give (iii. 10). The *moral* and *spiritual* education of his converts was far from being concluded. *Ecclesiastical* order was not entirely consolidated. Another difficulty weighed upon hearts, many of them doubtless tender and refined. The *eschatology* of the Gospel taught that the *parousia* of the Lord would be the time of rest and deliverance. The language in which the Advent was described was of a kind which might be misconceived by ardent minds, not yet in possession of the equilibrium of Christian doctrine. Death had been busy

[1] Liv. *Hist.* xlv. 10, 45.

[2] Thessalonica appears at a later period in unhappy connection with the Emperor Theodosius (see note *infra* on iv. 18). It was the scene of a defeat of Constantius by the Saracens. Constantius had been led to make the attack by a dream, in which he seemed to himself to be at Thessalonica. There is a curious story that one of his lieutenants predicted success to the other side from the fanciful etymology, Θὲς ἄλλῳ τὴν νίκην. The city was afterwards sold to the Venetians by Andronicus, but captured by the Turks (see Leusden, *Phil. Hebræo-Græc.*, Dissertat. xxii. p. 180, who refers to a book upon Thessalonica by Lucius Tarræus). Salonica is now looked upon as the *third* city of the Turkish Empire, Smyrna being the *second*. The population at present is estimated at 85,000, of whom about half are Jews. There is a singular community at Salonica, of Jewish origin, numbering about 6500—the descendants of those who, at the time of the conquest, nominally embraced Islamism, and who still externally conform to that religion, but who are, even at present, universally believed to hold the Jewish faith in their heart, and to practise its ceremonial in secret. See Letter of 'Standard' correspondent from Salonica, March 20, 1878.

Digitized by Google

since the departure of the Apostle. Converts had fallen asleep in Jesus. They had not seen the cloud of the Coming, nor heard the Archangel's trump. What of those dear ones? Had they suffered some great loss, or been deprived of some precious gift?

Such was the general posture of mind and contexture of circumstances in the Church of Thessalonica. The Apostle would gladly have revisited a community for which he felt the tenderest affection. Insurmountable obstacles were in the way. He must be satisfied with writing an Epistle to the Thessalonians to comfort them under a storm of persecution; to acquaint them with his reasons for not visiting them; to give an answer to the afflicting doubts of gentle and susceptible spirits; to warn them of possible practical dangers, and to express a father's love and gratitude for the large measure of good to be found among them.

The Epistles of St. Paul begin with his second missionary voyage, and of all his letters the two written to the Church of Thessalonica must be placed first.

It appears certain that the Epistle could not have been written *after* St. Paul's abode at Corinth; for in the opening salutation we see the name of Silvanus, which after that and 2 Thess. ii. 1 disappears from the Apostle's company. It could not have been written *before;* for those who had to bring St. Paul news from Macedonia found him not at Athens, but were allowed to join him at Corinth (Acts xvii. 15, *seqq.*, to xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 1). It was *not* then written at *Athens*,[1] but at *Corinth.* Nor was it written at the beginning of St. Paul's abode in that city. 1 Thess. i. 7, 8, proves that St. Paul must have remained at Corinth some time for the reputation of the Thessalonian Christians to have acquired such currency.[2]

## II.

The *contents* of this Epistle are of peculiar interest and importance, from the fact of its being the earliest among the Apostolic Epistles.

1. First in the order of importance stands the *dogmatic* element in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. It has become too common to assume that each Epistle of St. Paul has, so to speak, a Christology of its own. This view has been pushed to its extremest logical consequences by those who conclude with M. Renan that "the excellent heroes of the apostolic age were perpetually changing and contradicting themselves, that they used three or four different theories in the course of their lives, and condescended to borrow from the very adversaries to whom they had been most severe."—The most thorough and successful answer to this theory must consist in examining the very earliest of the Pauline letters, and convincing ourselves that the same Christology underlies it which finds such magnificent expression, *e. g.*, in the Epistle to the Colossians. Such an examination may lead to a grave doubt of the accuracy or propriety of terming the Epistle before us the "least dogmatic of all the letters of St. Paul."[1]

### A.

What view, then, is taken of the Person of Jesus in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians by St. Paul, as he looks up to the Heaven where his Master had ascended not much more than twenty years before?

(*a*) St. Paul speaks of Jesus as "the Lord," "our Lord," about twenty-five times in First Thessalonians. The full force of the title is scarcely realized by ordinary readers, or the concentration of dogma which it possessed for those who first used it.

Of the four great Names of God in the Old Testament, Jehovah is the most solemn. A believing Jew will not bring

[1] So in the subscription of many MSS, misled by 1 Thess. iii. 1.

[2] Reithmayer, *Introd. Lib. Can.* (French transl.), p. 200.

[1] At all events, if it be verbally accurate to speak of First Thessalonians as the least dogmatic, and of Colossians as the most dogmatic of St. Paul's Epistles, there is no ground for concluding that in ten years the Apostle's dogmatic point of view had grown different and larger. An impartial examination of the two will show that the same mind was at work upon two different sets of circumstances with the same apparatus of dogmatic principles.



Digitized by Google

himself to pronounce it. It implies that eternal, necessary, changeless existence which is the peculiarity of the God of the Bible. In the classical mythologies we meet with gods who have adventures. But the God of the Bible has no adventures, no personal history.[1] This peculiar name of God is *Lord* (Κύριος) in the LXX; and passed on into the New Testament.[2] The New Testament writers take it up, and give it to Jesus. He is "our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. i. 1–3; iii. 11, &c.)

It is impossible, then, for any subsequent declaration of the Divinity of Christ to rise beyond that afforded by St. Paul's frequent application of the attribute of "Lord" to Jesus in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.[3] The Apostle has already exhausted human language and human thought. The plummet of dogma can drop no deeper; the wing of adoration can soar no higher.

(*b*) But not only is the recognition of Jesus as "the Lord" a speculative dogma in the mind of the writer of this Epistle; it is carried out fearlessly in practice. All worship is, upon Scriptural principles, confined to God alone. But worship is freely given to Christ in First Thessalonians. Therefore it was the dogmatic conviction of the writer of that letter that Christ is God.

The Jews were raised up to witness, not only the unity and spirituality of God, but the absolute exclusiveness of His worship. Much of the perplexity that has been felt as to the possibility of the Jews falling into idolatry has been occasioned by forgetfulness of this fact. They worshipped Jehovah, swore by Him, and kept His feasts; but they joined other gods with Him in a degrading syncretism.[1] All worship, without distinction, of any but God was constructively idolatry.[2]

Religious errors have their root in a want. And idolatry is the expression of the want of a God who can come near to us.[3] This need was satisfied in Jesus. All the majesty, beauty, and love of God was brought near to us in Him. He was like us in form, feature, growth, function, language, affections, capacity of suffering. He was unlike us in all else—so like that He is our brother, so unlike that He is our God. Before that superhuman Humanity we may bow down without peril of idolatry. For our worship does not terminate in the Manhood; its object is the Divine Person who is God as well as Man.[4]

It is, surely, most striking and most significant that in the earliest of St. Paul's Epistles Christ is explicitly worshipped by prayer.[5] "He our God and Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ,

[1] M. Guizot, *Méditations*. Exod. iii. 2, 3; Malachi iii. 6.

[2] Christ is not directly called "the Lord," "the Lord Jesus" in St. Matthew or Mark (but see St. Matt. vii. 20, 21, and Note on St. Mark xvi. 19). He is repeatedly so termed by St. Luke. For St. John, see especially xx. 2, 13, 18, 28. In Acts and the Epistles it passes into an appellative. As last words are weighty, the closing words of the whole canon of scripture should be studied. The list of passages in which Christ is so termed occupies nearly fifteen columns of Brüder's *Concordantia*.

[3] Since this introduction was composed, the writer's attention has been directed to the following powerful sentences. "The Christology of the Colossian Epistle is in no way different from that of the Apostle's earlier letters. The doctrine is practically involved in the opening and closing words of his earliest extant Epistle. (1 Thess. i. 1; v. 28.)"—Bp. Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*.

[1] Zephaniah i. 5.

[2] It has been strangely maintained that the principle that any degree of worship short of the highest is not idolatry, is the final outcome of the Arian controversy. (Newman on Development, p. 405). Rather, the greatest Catholic thinkers accused Arians of being Pagans in principle, because the Arians worshipped one whom they considered in the last analysis a creature. The Pagan worshipped one God and many subordinate deities; the Arian worshipped one supreme God and one inferior God. (*εἰ δὲ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες ἑνὶ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ πολλοῖς γεννητοῖς λατρεύουσιν, οὗτοι δὲ ἑνὶ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἑνὶ γεννητῷ, οὐδ᾽ οὕτω διαφέρουσιν Ἑλλήνων . . τοῖς δὲ Ἕλλησι συγκυλίονται.* St. Athan., Oratio iii. c. Arianos, 448.) Their worship was, therefore, tainted with Paganism.

[3] Cf. Job xxiii. 8, 9, with St. John i. 18.

[4] *οὐ κτίσμα προσκυνοῦμεν, μὴ γένοιτο, ἐθνικῶν γὰρ καὶ Ἀρειανῶν ἡ τοιαύτη πλάνη . . . εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτὴ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὴν μέρος ἐστὶ τῶν κτισμάτων, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ γέγονε σῶμα. Καὶ οὔτε τὸ τοιοῦτον σῶμα καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸ διαιροῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου προσκυνοῦμεν, οὔτε τὸν Λόγον προσκυνῆσαι θέλοντες μακρύνομεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκός.* —Athan. *Epist. ad Adelphium*, 729.

[5] *κατευθύναι*, 1 Thess. iii. 11.

Digitized by Google

direct our way unto you. But you the Lord make to increase and abound in love," cries St. Paul (iii. 11, 12). This is of surpassing strength and dogmatic precision. The two grammatical subjects are connected with a verb in the singular,[1] indicating distinct Personality and unity of substance with united operation; yet a passage in the Second Epistle goes beyond even this. In a prayer so like that in the former letter in point of construction[2] as to indicate the identity of the fixed dogmatic mould from which it issued, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ stands *before* that of the Father.

The strongest expression of the *worship* of Christ is thus found in the first written of the extant Epistles of St. Paul.[3] It might seem as if the whole mind and thought, heart and intellect of the martyr at whose death he had assisted had passed into St. Paul. For St. Stephen's discourse, and the charge against him, together with his dying prayer, contain in germ all the Pauline theology. That Jesus shall "change the rites which Moses delivered unto us"[4] is the root idea of the whole momentous controversy upon the Law developed by St. Paul in several Epistles. That a dying believer worshipped Christ with such prayer as could be rightly offered to God only[5] was a fact which had behind it the dogma of the Divinity of Christ. As the echo of Stephen's teaching about the law is prolonged in Galatians, so the echo of his prayer *to* Christ is prolonged and multiplied in the Epistles to the Thessalonians.[1]

The fact is of the weightiest import for those who believe that St. Paul was an inspired Apostle, and addressed a larger audience than those to whom he first wrote—even the Church of all ages.

## B.

What view is taken by St. Paul of Christ's work in the first of his apostolic letters?

Our conclusion upon the whole is as follows:—

It conveys a thoroughly false impression to say that none of the great doctrines, which are considered especially Pauline, are to be found in these memorable chapters. Those doctrines are, of course, not presented to us in precisely the same investiture of words with which they were afterwards clothed. Or, to change the figure, they are not fashioned exactly in the same shape in which they were afterwards fused by the fires of controversy. But they are there in principle and in essence. The raw material, so to speak, of dogma in the so-called "undogmatic" Ep. to the Thessalonians is the same as in the so-called "dogmatic" Ep. to the Colossians. Even believing criticism has, perhaps, sometimes gone too far in finding one set of dogmas, one exclusive Christological aspect, in one Epistle. The Person of Christ, whole and entire, was present to the mind of the Apostle, and he addressed himself to his task equipped, not with fragments of disconnected Christological fancies suggested by successive circumstances, but with one central and perfect conception, which he interpreted and presented to others. Thus it is often assumed that the conception of Christ in heaven is the one

[1] Unstudied expressions often throw great light upon the principles of the professors of any creed. The early Christians were instinctively designated by themselves and others as those who habitually "call upon the Name of the Lord." (Acts ix. 14, 21; xxii. 16; Rom. x. 12, 13, 14; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22.)

[2] *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κ. ἡμῶν Ι. Χ. καὶ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν . . . παρακαλέσαι ὑμᾶς*—2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. For an instance of the same construction, cf. *Πατὴρ καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντα ἐργάζεται* (S. Joann. Chrysost. *in Joann. Homil.* xxv.), where Sir Henry Savile points out the dogmatic idea underlying the grammatical construction.

[3] Bengel says, with singular beauty:—"Utraque Epistola ad Thessalonicenses ferè singula capita singulis suspiriis obsignata habet." Most of these "suspiria" are addressed to Jesus.

[4] Acts vi. 14.

[5] Acts vii. 5–9.

[1] The N. T. passages for direct invocation and adoration of Christ, adduced by Melanchthon, are mainly from these Epistles. He adds, "These are testimonies to perpetual invocation of Christ, even when He is not visibly with men." (Opp. i. 153.) For worship of Christ, in the O. T., the writer may be allowed to refer to the Bampton Lecture, 1874, pp. 193–224, 2nd edit.



Digitized by Google

Christological idea of the Epistle to the Colossians, something peculiar to that Epistle, and constituting its difference from all others—a step on which St. Paul found himself at the close of a series of developments. But the ascended Christ, at the Right Hand of God, does not crowd out every other object in the picture drawn for the Colossians. Christ, in contradistinction to Angels, the Centre of the Universe,[1] the Beginning,[2] is not so exclusively presented that the Incarnation is forgotten.[3] The very Body with its actual human capacities,[4] the very Blood that flowed from human veins,[5] are the porch through which we pass onward and upward. Thus, again, it is asserted that none of the peculiarly Pauline doctrines are in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, the suppressed conclusion in some cases being that St. Paul had not yet developed or invented them. But the discourse of St. Paul at Antioch of Pisidia affords a complete historical contradiction to this. For that discourse was delivered some years before the Epistle to the Thessalonians was written, the earliest of all St. Paul's letters. If it be true that that Epistle contains "nothing of justification by faith, not by works of the law," it is certain that the omission does not arise from ignorance, or from the fact that the idea had never been presented to the writer's mind. For, in the presence of the rulers of the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, he had said several years before: "Through this man is preached to you the forgiveness of sins, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."[6] Nor is it true that the Epistle to the Thessalonians is so entirely engrossed by the thought of Christ coming in the great *Parousia* that He occupies no other position. We have seen that in Colossians the preacher of the ascended Lord at the Right Hand of God is not so engaged with this aspect of the Saviour that he forgets Bethlehem and Calvary. It is easy to show that the author of the letters to the Thessalonians does not lose the balance of dogma in an absorbing and one-sided presentation of the Advent. The following dogmatic Christological principles are to be found in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

1. Christ is *Divine*.

*Titles.*

(*a*) The Lord Jesus, ii. 15.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, ii. 19, v. 23.

The Lord Himself, iv. 16. [There is an untranslatable dignity in the original Αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος—HE, THE LORD. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 16.]

The Lord—*passim*.

(*b*) *Divinely conjoined with the Father.*

The Church in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, i. 1.

(*c*) Prayed to with Him.

"He, our God and Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way." (1 Thess. iii. 11). The verb "direct" is here in the third person singular opt. κατευθύναι, though with two subjects grammatically. Precisely in the same way "He, our Lord Jesus Christ, and our God and Father," are followed by the third person singular optative παρακαλέσαι in 2 Thess. ii. 17. The inversion of the order, and the majestic αὐτός applied in one place to the Father, in the other to Christ, are very significant. Underlying both passages would seem to be the *equality* of the Father with the Son indicated by this, and the *identity* of the operation proceeding from

[1] Coloss. i. 15, 16.

[2] Coloss. i. 18. "Who is the Beginning."

[3] Coloss. ii. 6.

[4] "In the body of His Flesh." Coloss. i. 22.

[5] Coloss. i. 20 (v. 14 cannot be quoted as proof).

[6] Acts xiii. 38, 39. See Archdeacon Hannah's Bampton Lectures, pp. 216–217. It should carefully be noted that the conception of the abolition of the Law—or its absorption in a higher ideal—was not 'imported by Paul into Christianity'; but formed an integral part of the recorded teaching of our Lord. This *principle*, and one marked *illustration* of it, may be found in direct succession in St. Luke; the *principle* in the parable (v. 36), the *application* in the case of the Sabbath (vi. 1–9, common to the three synoptics). The same *principle* is placed by St. John in the forefront of his Gospel (i. 17.)

Digitized by Google

both, indicated by the singular verbs. It is the nearest possible reflection of the Almighty *cannot* in "The *Son can do* nothing of *Himself*." (St. John v. 19). The distinct mention of the Father and the Son prevents any danger of the *identity of working* in the singular verb being misconstrued into a "*confusion of the Persons*."

2. Christ *in Heaven*.

To wait for His Son from *Heaven*, i. 10. He, the Lord, shall descend from *Heaven*, iv. 16.

3. Christ *coming again*, the Resurrection and the Life, iv. 14–18.

4. Christ, *the Redeemer*,

(*a*) ever *delivering from the wrath*, i. 11.

(*b*) The *medium of salvation*,

"—to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ," v. 9.

(*c*) Giving *us life through His Death*.

"—Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him," v. 10.

No "Christology" or "Soteriology" in the N. T. can go beyond this.

2. The *eschatological* element in the Epistles to the Thessalonians is peculiarly abundant.

As the supposed error of the early Church in reference to our Lord's Coming is mainly inferred from one passage in First Thessalonians (iv. 17); it may be well in this place to enter upon the examination of the so-called Apocalyptic elements in the conception of the kingdom of God, which is found in the record of our Lord's teaching. In this part of our survey, we may first consider and account for the apparent promise of an immediate Advent, of which some venture to speak so freely.

It is in reference to this so-called Apocalyptic element that M. Renan makes the most distinct and definite statements in his 'Life of Jesus.' Thus he states, in various passages, that "Christ's declaration upon the proximity of the world's catastrophe leaves no room for any equivocation:"—that "the world has *not* ended, as He announced;"—that "we must excuse His hope of a vain Apocalypse;"—that "He accepted the utopias of His time and race, though we must not despise His chimera;"—that "the literal acceptation by the disciples, and at certain moments by the Master himself, of an immediate and outward Judgment, comes out in the writings of the time with absolute evidence;" that "the realistic conception of the Divine Advent has been a shadow of passing deception which that death has caused us to forget."

Every one who has listened carefully to the New Testament has heard in it the strokes of a grand and solemn knell over creation. This knell, indeed, is much older than the New Testament. The two first prophecies are of the first and second Advent. When man had only come from his Maker's hand about a thousand years, Enoch rung it first, "Behold, the Lord cometh!" The Church has been waiting five thousand years. But the aged Creation lingers on still. The priests of God stand waiting at the gate, and the bell tolls on, but the funeral train has not yet appeared.

We can account for these passages, and offer some proofs that the solution is true.

In the *first* place, then, many of these passages, especially the most striking of all in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew, are to be interpreted according to the analogy of all prophecy. Except in a few specified cases, time is not defined by the prophets. The future is projected like a timeless picture before the soul of the seer. Objects which are near seem almost to touch those which are remote. This may be illustrated by the beautiful optical illusion which causes the broad disk of the setting sun to seem as if it crushed down upon the western hills, or the moon to appear as if its white fire were actually interwoven through the sombre mass of a grove.

Our Lord, indeed, differs from other prophets. They needed a divine enthusiasm to make them receptive of the prophetic influence. The sound of a lyre awakened, or the lulling music of waters, calmed them. We feel that they were animated by an extraneous impulse, that they "spake as they were *moved* by the Holy Ghost." But the spirit of prophecy is not a suddenly infused light in

Digitized by Google

our Lord's mind, momentarily illuminating distant prospects like the lightning flash, and then dying away. The mysteries of futurity, the ages to come, are seen by a habitual light. Still, our Lord as prophet conformed to the very characteristics of prophecy. The prophets were not historians by anticipation. They were describers of pictures unseen by others. They saw in *juxtaposition*, not in *succession*. A lyrical ode, it has been said, is sometimes connected by threads more delicate, though not less real, than those which bind together the parts of a closely-written philosophical essay. Much more is this true of prophecy. There are various kinds of method. There is the method of logical order. There is the method of a sermon, a poem, and a history. Method, in the true sense, is the apt disposition of a number of topics which may be referred to a common centre. Let us allow the prophets to follow a deeper order of their own.[1] Swiftly and noiselessly from the luminous centre of some divine principle, the prophetic spirit radiates to the furthest circumference of human events, with an order which is generally real, not chronological.

There is a *second* principle which we should bear in mind while we study those passages in Scripture which M. Renan calls Apocalyptic, and which may seem to speak of a visible and impending catastrophe. The Bible philosophy of history is not Mr. Buckle's. All history is a long judgment, a long coming of the Lord. It is much to be regretted that so many of us have ceased to speak, like our forefathers, of the Last Judgment. He shall come to be our Judge. Nay, "verily He is a God that judgeth in the earth." There has been a judgment, or a series of judgments, along the whole track of human history. It was so even in Paradise. The Jewish nation was chosen to be a palpable specimen of God's eternal Providence, an example of His moral government. In their history we have an unveiling of the principles of His judgment. Ever and anon there pierce through the tangled story strange foregleams of the judgment fires and of the heavenly light. Such is the argument of the Book of Judges, and of the Books of Kings. "Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together."[1] In hot climates, God has so overruled the instincts of the winged scavengers of the air and peak, that they swoop down upon the carrion, and remove it out of the way. There is such a thing as moral carrion. Wherever there is a body of moral and spiritual death, a dead church, a dead state, there "the carcase is." Such to a believing man is the aspect of history. Still the eagles are gathering together. Still the breath of spring ripples through the trees. Still He comes with clouds. Still the saints cry, "The great day of the Lord is near." So has it been through many cycles of history, the destruction of Jerusalem, the fall of Rome, the Reformation, the French Revolution, our own time. So shall it be until, after passing through all typical judgments, the Last Judgment shall darken over the human race.[2]

There is a *third* thought which we may take with us, while we interpret the "Apocalyptic element" in our Redeemer's teaching. Suppose, then, that it was His intention to use language which should place His generation, and each successive generation, in the position of those who *might* be alive at His coming, at the same time so adjusting the perspective of His teaching that those who lived far away should be able to apprehend the precise point of view better than His own contemporaries. Does not this supposition meet the facts of the case? "*Immediately* after the tribulation of those days." "These and similar

[1] "O logician, God hath a method of His own, the prophetical method, which no rules of Aristotle will define."—*Edward Irving.*

[1] St. Matt. xxiv. 28.

[2] On the *continuous* Judgment of God; the meaning of *Day* as a period of undefined duration; and the importance of preserving the old phrase, "*Last* Judgment;" see Augustine's profound argument,—"Per quot dies hoc judicium tendatur, incertum est; sed Scripturarum more diem poni solere pro tempore nemo nescit. Ideo autem cum diem judicii Dei dicimus, addemus *ultimum* vel *novissimum*."—*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 1.

Digitized by Google

declarations," says M. Renan, "leave no room for equivocation." "Those (observes Gibbon) who understood in a literal sense the discourses of Christ Himself, were obliged to expect the second and glorious coming of the Son of Man in the clouds, before that generation was totally extinguished, which had beheld His humbler condition upon earth, and which might still be witness of the calamities of the Jews under Vespasian or Hadrian. The revolution of seventeen centuries has instructed us not to press too closely the mysterious language of prophecy and revelation." Yet in the span of that same mysterious discourse, there occur repeated notices, which we must be blind, indeed, if we cannot read. "But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth His coming,"[1]—a prophecy surely, of a time in the Church, not of unbelief, but of ambition and worldliness, like the middle ages. "While the bridegroom tarried," the word in the original almost means "spinning out the time."[2] Again, "after a long time, the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them."[3] Surely that space can have been no dream of the morning which seemed long to Him who said, "Before Abraham was, I am." We need not dwell upon the commission "to go into all lands," upon the institution by Christ of a church, and the inculcation of a morality, adapted to a world which was destined to last.

The application of these principles to our Lord's so called Apocalyptic declarations on the kingdom of God solves all difficulties. The vision of prophecy presents objects in juxtaposition, not succession, in space, so to speak, rather than time, mystically not chronologically; its objects are lifted into a relation beyond and out of time. All history is viewed, as it is viewed by God, as even we can view it when we see it in plan rather than in section. That is, it is a cycle of typical judgments, finished and completed in the Last Judgment, of which each successive crisis possesses some general characteristics. Add to this the moral and spiritual ends which are gained by keeping the Advent before each successive generation.

We shall adduce two arguments to show that, if not this interpretation, at least its results must necessarily be true.

Consider, then, the opening verses of the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. The view supposed to be Apostolical, supposed to be Christ's, *does* arise. How is it treated? Why as a fanaticism, a falsehood, and a delusion. St. Paul beseeches them, not exactly by, but (as Professor Jowett well translates it) "on behalf of, as though he were teaching in honour of that day, that the expectation of it might not be a source of disorder in the church."

But further. Admit not merely that the primitive Christians looked for and expected Christ (which they did, at that time, with an almost excessive tension) but, that they considered that "experience would belie Him cruelly, if the world was obstinate enough to last on after that generation," what would have been the result?—Why this, that when St. John, or the last survivor of Christ's immediate followers died, Christianity would have died with him. Perhaps as the storm darkened up the sky of Palestine, or as by the shores of the Ægean the sun went down in the dark cloud, or in the burning sky, a knot of poor fanatics might have looked for the sign of the Son of Man, the cross of fire, or the pierced form. But if the Gospel had been committed to that false hope, it must have been carried from its cradle to its grave. The Gospel has survived much. It has survived ten persecutions. It has survived the syllogism, the epigram, and the scaffold—Diocletian, Porphyry, and Voltaire. It has survived caricatures of its doctrines, and abuses of its holiness. It is strong enough to bear the burden of man's hopes, and the mightier burden of man's sorrows. But there is one thing which it will never survive, a refutation before the face of honest reason. There is one burden which it cannot bear, and that burden is a lie. If the Gospel had committed men to one vision-

[1] St. Matt. xxiv. 48.
[2] χρονίζοντος δὲ τοῦ νυμφίου, St. Matt. xxv. 5—the same word translated by "delayeth," xxiv. 48.
[3] St. Matt. xxv. 19.

Digitized by Google

ary expectation, it must have expired though the destiny of humanity would have expired with it. But, just at the time when, according to M. Renan's interpretation of the great Teacher's words, their falsity was manifested, martyrs were preparing to bleed for them, and missionaries were starting with a lie in their right hand to announce it to the utmost ends of the earth. If the Gospel, if Christ and His apostles, had been committed to the doctrine that He must visibly appear in one generation, the Gospel must have died out with that generation. But the Gospel did not so die out. Therefore, the Gospel was committed to no such doctrine.

The view advocated on the interpretation of ἡμεῖς (1 Thess. iv. 17) is confirmed by considerations derived from passages external to these Epistles. St. Paul was an extensive traveller, and knew the obstinacy of his countrymen. He did not expect the close of the present dispensation without a great ingathering of the Jews. Did he suppose that this would be the work of the few years which yet remained to him? (Rom. xi. 25, 26.) There are passages in which he speaks clearly of his own death and resurrection (1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14, v. 2; Philipp. i. 23; 2 Tim. iv. 6). These expressions are logically inconsistent with a formulated belief on the part of St. Paul that Christ would come before he died. The following is St. Augustine's view of St. Paul's teaching in 1 Thess. v. 1, 2: "He showed that it was not necessary for them to know this—sufficient was it for them to be sure that, whilst men shall be slumbering and unprepared, the Lord will come as a thief. By believing this, they would be wakefully prepared after the lapse of any amount of time. St. Paul kept within his own limits, in that, apostle though he were, he did not presume to teach others, because he knew that *the Apostle* of our profession had said 'it is not yours to know.'"[1]

The practical point to be perceived in regard to the eschatological element in these Epistles is this. One vision fills the souls of the Thessalonian converts—that of the great Coming. At first, it is in danger of assuming fanatical proportions, and shaking their lives to the very centre. A few calm words in the Second Epistle plead for the honour of the great Advent,[1] and of the majestic gathering to the Redeemer. Then the perspective, for a while disturbed, was permanently re-adjusted, and remains at the same point even now, securing the perfect practical coincidence of the natural order of things with the supernatural expectation. When men seek to state the exact day, and that a near day, St. Paul, speaking through the ages, blames such fanaticism, and points us back to our Lord's words.[2] He puts down the childish fingers that count the number of the days. "Of that day and hour knoweth no one."[3]

3. The *Moral* and *Social* element in these Epistles next demands consideration.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians mark an era in the formation of Scripture. The letter claims its place beside the prophecy and the history. The first specimen of the new form of Scripture is before us, and it directly meets one of the deepest wants of the old society.

What ethical or social lesson, indicative

[1] Dank. *Hist. Rev. Div.* ii. 370, 371. Cf. Burgenhardt, *De cæt. Thessalon. ortu*, p. 152. Simar, *Die Theol. des h. Paulus*, pp. 228, sqq.

[1] ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τ. Κυρ., 2 Thess. ii. 1.

[2] 1 Thess. v. 1.

[3] "Omnes calculantium digitos resolvit." (St. August.) St. Matt. xxiv. 36. Two anecdotes of two very different men well illustrate that practical combination of energetic discharge of duty with Advent expectation which these Epistles have mainly secured to the Church. When Francis of Sales was once, after intense labour, unbending himself at a game of chess, some morbid precisian who was near asked him what he would do, if he knew that the Lord's coming was even at hand. "Finish the game," said the Bishop, boldly. "For His glory I began it." General Lee wrote a striking story to his son, in a letter which has found its way into print. Last century, in New England, a day of sudden and unaccountable gloom, known yet by tradition as "the dark day," occurred while the senate of the state was sitting. The universal impression was that Doomsday had indeed come. Suddenly a well-known member stood up. "President," said he, "I propose that lights be brought in, and that we pass to the order of the day. If the Judge comes, He had best find us at our duty."

Digitized by Google

in a special way of Christian morality, may we derive from the study of the first written among the Epp. of St. Paul?

Much might be said of the new virtue, (as it might be called) of *purity*—of the new and awful line drawn round the citadel of the human soul by the gift of the Holy Spirit to those who believed and were baptized.[1] But there is another vein of exhortation in the Ep. to the Thessalonians, pregnant with momentous social consequences.

Just before that glorious passage, which St. Paul's unrivalled tenderness and majesty never exceeded—in which he tells of the descent of the Lord from heaven, and the gathering of the redeemed[2]—he speaks with peculiar emphasis of a class of duties, in his mind evidently connected with true "brotherly love."[3] Their ambition should be to be quiet, to do their own business, to work with their own hands. The result of this will be twofold—a peculiar dignity of aspect in the eyes of those as yet external to the communion of the Church, and the honourable independence which can enable them to dispense with the contemptuous pity of any man's alms. In the Second Epistle he assumes a severer and more sarcastic tone against those who are only busy with that which is no business of theirs; and commands and exhorts with impassioned earnestness, even "by our Lord Jesus Christ," to work with quietness, and eat *their own* bread, not that of other people.

Few persons, perhaps, have remarked how significant this style of exhortation is of a new world, and a new order of ideas. For in spite of ultra-democratic appearances, there was in Greek society an ultra-aristocratic spirit in its most evil form — the ultra-aristocracy of culture as well as of social position. As regards the former, tradesmen and mechanics were held to be incapable of true philosophy or spiritual religion, or refined thought.[4] As regards the latter, one of the worst influences of slavery was the discredit which it threw upon free labour, and all the smaller forms of commerce.[1] Aristotle treats with cold cynicism everything of the sort.[2] The tradesman or mechanic is but a higher kind of slave—differing from him in kind, not in degree—bearing the same relation to the public which the slave bears to the individual. To do any work which marks or curves the body; to live upon daily pay; to be connected with the detail of fabrications, or with sales in the public markets; this was to degrade a freeman, and to *plebeianize* his spirit as well as his body. Such were the ideas of Aristotle, who knew Macedonia so well, and had lived in it so long—such the ideas which were in the very air of Thessalonica when St. Paul wrote his Epistles.[3] It is full of significance that the first Apostolic Epistle speaks out so boldly and earnestly upon the dignity and becomingness of industry, the nobility of working with our own

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 8.

[2] 1 Thess. iv. 14, *seqq.*

[3] 1 Thess. iv. 9–11, 12.

[4] See passages quoted by Neander—*History of the Church*, i. 39, 40—especially those from the 10th Book of Plotin. *Ennead.* Compare the contemptuous tone of the Pharisees in St. John viii. 49.

[1] See the admirable pages in M. Wallon's *Histoire de l'Esclavage*, i. 446, *seqq.*

[2] The reader need but refer to any good index to the Politics of Aristotle, and examine the list of quotations under the heads of βάναυσος, βάναυσον. Men generally did not believe that he who lived the daily life of the βάναυσος, could cultivate virtue with unbroken devotion. (*Polit.* iii. 5.) The great author's cynical dislike of the arrant mechanic found its culminating point in the χερνῆτες. "These are," as he says, "those who live, as their name denotes, ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν." (*Polit.* iii. iv. 2; cf. *Rhetor.* i. ix. 27.) What a contrast to St. Paul's elevating ambition "to work with your *own hands*" (1 Thess. iv. 11)—to the touching allusion to his own stained and horny hands (Acts, xx. 34)! The perfect form of civilized polity will not have a mechanic citizen (ἡ δὲ βελτίστη πόλις οὐ ποιήσει βάναυσον πολίτην. Arist. *Pol.* iii. v. 7). But that "city which hath the foundations" opens its impartial gates widely for the reception of such.

[3] Colonel Leake places Stagirus at the modern village of Stauros, near the shore of the Strymonic Gulf (Leake's *Northern Greece*, chap. xxv.). Sir George Bowen shows strong reason for doubting this, by a reference to *Herod.* vii. 15. For a brilliant defence of the "universal tradition of the Macedonian peasants," which assigns the honour of having given birth to Aristotle to Isboros (Ἰσβορός), within a day's ride of Thessalonica, see *Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus*, pp. 120, *seqq.*

Digitized by Google

hands, though they may be blackened by the work—the duty of preferring our own coarse bread, won by the sweat of our brow, to the precarious food of the beggar, or the ignominious luxury of the parasite. This was one great social and moral result of the message, which, if its origin was in God's eternal counsels, came from a carpenter's shop, and was published by a company of fishermen, among whom a tent-maker of Tarsus had obtained admission.

4. The First Epistle to the Thessalonians has often been pronounced to be as entirely unecclesiastical as it is supposed to be undogmatic.

It is hard for one writing at this time to examine such an allegation fairly, accurately, and without prepossession. By means of maps and descriptions we can form a picture to our mind of the Bay of Thessalonica, and see the semicircle of houses rising towards the hills with something of the air of an inferior Genoa. But it is much more difficult for us to see the earliest Thessalonian Christians exactly as they were. We instinctively think of something like churches. In Salonica, at the present day, three of these are still found which have been turned into mosques. One of these (S. Sophia) has a very ancient pulpit of beautiful marble, from which the local tradition reports that St. Paul preached while at Thessalonica.[1] Yet the Christians of the place could, of course, have had no separate buildings, and must have been content to meet in the house of Jason,[2] of Aristarchus, of Secundus,[3] or of some other believer. Yet there are certain lines of church life and organization which we can fairly trace in the Epistles to the Thessalonians.

(*a*) St. Paul recognizes the Thessalonians, then, at this early period, as one organized body, as a *church.*[4] At a period considerably later he does not always so address those to whom he writes.[5]

[1] *Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus,* by Mr. (now Sir George F.) Bowen, P. 40.

[2] Acts xvii. 5.

[3] Θεσσαλονικέων δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Σεκοῦνδος. Acts xx. 21.

[4] 1 Thess. i. 1.

[5] See Colossians i. 1, 2.

(*b*) That these believers were all *baptized* is necessarily implied in the very conception of a *church.* If it be thought that we look at the question too much through the afterthoughts of ecclesiastical and technical theology, let us consider a fact in St. Paul's own life, and a passage in this epistle.

1. St. Paul's own history and experience show that he was not likely to entertain the notion that a believer could be united to the Church without the baptismal initiation. The direction which he himself had received from our Lord after his conversion led him to baptism.[1] If baptism was thus necessary for St. Paul, it must have been equally necessary for his converts.

2. But the Apostle recognizes baptism in this Epistle by most powerful practical teaching drawn from its very idea as a consecration of body, soul, and spirit, by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Were a preacher in a modern pulpit to warn his hearers against impurity, inward or outward, and to claim them for unsullied purity on the ground that they had received the Holy Spirit, and that their bodies were His temple,[2] it would at once be understood, even if baptism were not mentioned, that the reference was baptismal—nay, that it must be, if the speaker viewed that sacrament as the initial act of the Christian life.

It is from this point of view that the awful passage upon impurity (1 Thess. iv. 3, 8) must be considered. Sin of this kind, according to the Apostle, is not merely vice, or crime, or even ordinary sin. It is direct personal insult to the Holy Spirit. Such is the force of the solemn words, "God who also gave His Holy Spirit once for all *unto you.*"[3] He

[1] Acts ix. 18; xxii. 16.

[2] The modern objection to this doctrine, on the ground that Christians *collectively,* not *singly,* form the Temple of the Holy Spirit, has been answered by anticipation with a felicity which scarcely admits of translation—"Hujus enim *templum simul omnes,* et *singuli templa* sumus." St. Augustin. *De Civ. Dei,* x. 3.

[3] τὸν Θεὸν, τὸν καὶ δόντα τὸ Π. τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς, 1 Thessal. iv. 8. The εἰς ὑμᾶς is very emphatic. (On εἰς, with verbs of giving, almost with the force of "giving over to," see note *infra* 1 Thess. iv. 8.) The reading is certainly

Digitized by Google

is speaking of a great isolated act and gift once given, of that gift which is the Holy Ghost Himself. It is the same point of view from which St. Paul always surveys baptism—only that in the first of his Epistles it is more suitable to look at the gift in the hand and heart of the Giver; afterwards, in the hands and hearts of the receivers. It is the Divine baptismal aorist active of the Giver which is exactly echoed again and again by the human baptismal aorist passive of reception.[1]

The Thessalonians were a church of baptized believers.

(*d*) The Thessalonian Church also possessed a *stated Ministry*. It is impossible to evade the force of the passage (1 Thess. v. 12, 13). Here there is a class of men, marked off from the general body of believers, to be recognized, esteemed, beloved, and that for their work's sake—a class of men who laboured, presided, admonished.

St. Paul was at Thessalonica but a few weeks, if the narrative in Acts (xvii. 1, 2) is to be very strictly pressed[2]—certainly not for any very lengthened period. He had now left them for a comparatively short interval; yet it is clear that he had provided, in some way, for ministerial order and succession. The Church was thus equipped and provided for a continued existence.

(*e*) There is evidence in the Epistle that the Church was gathered together at convenient opportunities—apparently for two purposes.

1. The "holy kiss" of affectionate greeting (v. 26) had evidently a character which was, so to speak, official and liturgical. To those who are, in any degree, conversant with Christian antiquity, the rite is integrally connected with the Holy Communion. In Justin Martyr's well-known passage describing early Christian worship it stands *between* the "Common Prayers" and the Eucharist, just before the Oblation.[1] The kiss of peace always accompanied the Holy Communion, both in the east and west ("Osculum pacis, Pax"). The only difference was in the time. In the East it was immediately before the oblation, in the West after the consecration and before the reception.[2]

2. But the Church further met to be instructed by reading.[3] The verse (v. 27) must be taken with that which precedes, to give it full significance. St. Paul's letters were destined for the widest publicity; intended to take the place of the Law and Prophets in the Synagogue worship—to be a Christian Law promulgated by public reading. It is scarcely necessary to observe what a guarantee was thus afforded for the authenticity of these letters, and what authority they claimed. The command of the Epistle was the command of the Apostle. When the Epistles came to be collected they were, in a sense, "the Apostle."

The Christians of Thessalonica, then, were a *Church*, consisting of *baptized* believers, with an organized *Ministry*—a Church, with gathered assemblies, where the *Holy Communion* was administered and the *Apostolic Epistles* were read as inspired Scripture.[4]

not ἡμᾶς, which would give the inappropriate meaning—"contempt of this warning is contempt of God, as surely as He has put His Holy Spirit in" [*us*] "His Apostles."—Keble, *Studia Sacra*, p. 232.

[1] See Romans vii. 1, 6; Coloss. ii. 11, 20; iii. 1–3, and the instructive pages in Bishop Lightfoot's *On Revision of the New Testament*, pp. 84–86.

[2] For reasons against this, see note *infra*, 1 Thess. ii. 9.

[1] Κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησάμενοι . . . ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν· Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος.—Justin. M. Apolog. i. 65. See *Comment. über d. Br. Pauli an d. Römer*; Baumgarten-Crusius, p. 425.

[2] On the Church's right to dispense with this ancient ceremony, see Hooker, *E. P.*, Preface iv. 4. Cf. also the authorities cited *infra*, note on 1 Thess. v. 26.

[3] "I charge you by the Lord that this Epistle be read (ἀναγνωσθῆναι) unto all the holy brethren" (1 Thess. v. 27). The aor. infin. here cannot be restricted to the usual aoristic sense of a single and final act. On the peculiar *timeless* or *eventual* sense of the aor. after verbs of "commanding, hoping," &c., see the accurate note of Bishop Ellicott, Ep. to Thessalonians, p. 88.

[4] The ecclesiastical element in the Epistles to the Thessalonians is brought out with great learning and clearness by Bishop Wordsworth in the second volume of his Commentary upon the New Testament.

Digitized by Google

At the early period in the history of Christianity when the Epistle was written the Christian society existed with well-defined outlines.

(*a*) No command to cohere into a Church—*But*, a *Church exists*. No command to be baptized—*But, baptism exists*.

"Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the *Church* of the Thessalonians," i. 1.

(*b*) No command to form a Ministry—*But*, an *authorized Ministry* exists.

"We beseech you to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake," v. 12, 13.

(*c*) No command to united assemblages—*But, united assemblages* exist; for at them, or one of them, the Epistle was to be read.

"I charge you by the Lord that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren," v. 27.

(*d*) No command to celebrate the Holy Communion—*But*, the *Holy Communion* exists (pre-supposed in the kiss, which must have been public, and was from the earliest times associated with the Holy Communion).

5. The *local* element in St. Paul's Epistles has been alternately overlooked and exaggerated. It was often overlooked by those who held a rigid mechanical view of the inspiration of Scripture, and forgot its human characteristics. It is in modern times, perhaps, frequently exaggerated by those who forget that the Epistles of St. Paul were meant for all ages of the Church, and addressed to more than their present readers.[1]

[1] The point of conciliation will be found in harmonizing two golden sentences—one written by the most learned commentator, the other by the profoundest theologian, of the Western Church. For the *local* and *temporary* element in St. Paul's Epistles—"Vultis scire quomodo Apostolus *unamquamque provinciam suis proprietatibus* denotârit?" (S. Hieron. *Comment. in Epist. ad Galat.*, Lib. ii. cap, ii. tom vii. 381, Edit. Migne). For the *permanent* element, the "eye of God's word" upon every generation in these Letters—"Doctorem gentium, qui . . . pluribus Epistolis populos Dei, non eos *tantum qui presentes* ab illo videbantur, verum etiam illos qui *futuri prævidebantur* instruxit." (St. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*. xiv. 9.)

In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians there are two local references which are worthy of special mention.

(*a*) At the beginning of the Epistle, St. Paul writes:—"For from you sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to Godward is spread abroad" (1 Thess. 1, 8). The Greek commentators in the picturesque word translated "sounded out," observe a metaphor derived from the trumpet's brilliant tone and power of distant resonance.[1] It can scarcely be doubted that St. Paul was thinking of the geographical position of Thessalonica which had been particularly noted by Cicero.[2] It was, indeed, by land a chief station on the great Roman military road (*via Egnatia*). as Cicero also observes; while by sea it had a principal share in the commerce of the Levant, and was in constant communication with almost every shore of the known world. When we take into account St. Paul's subtle tact in dealing with men, there seems to be much reason for finding, with Chrysostom, an allusion also to a history of which every Thessalonian must have been proud—an *historical* blended with a *geographical* reference. The Apostle may have lightly touched upon a new fame in the Gospel, succeeding to and surpassing the ancient Macedonian glory.[3]

[1] ἐξήχηται—λαμπρὸν ἠχούσης. (Theophyl.) "The resonance of the trumpet," says Chrysostom upon this verse, "fills the whole vicinity. But the fame of your excellence fills the world, and reaches all and everywhere with equal sound. Great deeds are celebrated with the distinctest commemoration where they were performed. They are, indeed, often celebrated far away, but not so much. It is not so with you. But the glorious sound has gone through the earth."

[2] "Thessalonicenses . . . *positi in gremio imperii nostri*." (*Orat. de Prov. Cons.*, ii.)

[3] In the verse generally, and more especially in the vivid words ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν ("spoken as if of a living thing"), Chrysostom seems to trace a reminiscence of the elastic and bounding symbol of Alexander's Macedonian empire in Daniel viii. 5–8. Rarely, indeed, could such words have afterwards been applied to the Church of Thessalonica. Cyril and Methodius, however, belonging to the Sclavo-Bulgarian nationality, which extends from the banks of the Danube to the mountains of Thessaly—Hellenized Sclaves—evangelized Moravia,

Digitized by Google

(*b*) The second *local* reference is more undeniable. It is also more important, because it illustrates that which is the chief social lesson in this Epistle.

In one of the most admirable passages of his writings Jerome adverts to St. Paul's power of laying his finger upon the distinguishing characteristics of every phase of human nature which he addressed in every region of the world. The simplicity,[1] the facility, the haughtiness[2] of the Roman character are reflected in his addresses to the Roman Christians. The intellectual pride of the Corinthians; the women boldly sitting in public assemblies with uncovered head, the men with long floating hair, used to heat themselves with wine in their temples, and carrying the same custom into a holier assembly and a more august rite, are observed by every careful reader of the letters to the Corinthians.[3] The hysterical[4] and passionate nature of the Celt is reflected from the mirror of the Epistle to the Galatians. One of the most notable instances of this feature in St. Paul's writings—Jerome proceeds to say—is to be found in the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The national type of character continued absolutely unchanged up to the time of the great commentator of the Western Church. We can often infer from a letter the character of him to whom it is addressed quite as clearly as the character of the writer. The same virtues of charity, hospitality, fraternal good-will; the same vices of indolence, aimless lounging, petty meanness in making oneself a parasite for the sake of daily food which the Epistles would lead us to attribute to one section of the people of Thessalonica, continued to mark the Macedonians of St. Jerome's day—it may be added, from the testimony of travellers, at the present moment.[1]

6. It is natural to ask how St. Paul handles *Scripture* in these Epistles.

It is certainly inaccurate to dismiss the question summarily, by replying that the Epistles to the Thessalonians contain no quotations from the Old Testament.[2] The following list will show clearly that there are several such :—

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Thess. | i. | 5 | ... | Psalm. xxix. 4.[3] |
| ,, | ii. | 16 | ... | Gen. xv. 16. |
| ,, | ,, | 18 | ... | Nehem. xiii. 20. |
| ,, | ,, | 19 | .. | Proverbs xvi. 31. |
| ,, | iv. | 9 | ... | Isaiah viii. 16; liv. 13. |
| ,, | ,, | 14 | ... | Psalm xlviii. 14. |
| ,, | ,, | 15, 16 | ... | Jerem. xxv. 30, 31. |
| ,, | v. | 3 | ... | Ezekiel xiii. 10. |
| ,, | ,, | 8 | ... | Isaiah lix. 17. |
| ,, | ,, | 14[4] | ... | Isaiah xxxv. 4. |
| 2 Thess. | i. | 8[5] | ... | Psalm xxix. 7. |
| ,, | ,, | 9[6] | ... | Psalm xxix. |
| ,, | ii. | 4 | ... | Daniel xi. 36. |
| ,, | ,, | 8 | ... | Psalm xxxiii. 6; Isaiah xi. 4. |
| ,, | iii. | 1 | ... | Psalm cxlviii. 15. |

What is certain is that (with the exception, perhaps, of 2 Thess. ii. 4, Daniel xi. 36) these references are, so to speak, half-conscious quotations—the reminiscences or allusions of a mind full of Scripture, not downright quotations for the purpose of discussion or authoritative settlement of questions. This

Bohemia, and Pannonia; and, like the best of our missionaries in modern times, created an alphabet for their converts. They were born in the 9th century at Thessalonica. (C. Jireczet, *Istoria Bulgar.* Odessa, 1879.) They have lately formed the subject of a Papal allocution, which testifies to the undying affection in which they are held by the Sclavo-Bulgarians.

[1] Rom. xvi. 17–19.

[2] Ibid. xi. 29, 25; xii. 3–15, 16.

[3] 1 Corinth. x. 14, 15, 20; iv. 6.

[4] *ἀνόητοι Γαλάται*, Galat. iii. 1.

[1] St. Jerome's words are well worth quoting: "Hæc ex parte *usque hodiè* permanere, non potest dubitare qui Achaiam viderit. Macedones in charitate laudantur, et hospitalitate ac susceptione fratrum. Unde ad eos scribitur (1 Thess. iv. 9) sed reprehenduntur (Ibid. 10, 11) —quod ne quis putet officio magis docentis quam *vitio gentis* admonitum. . . . in Secundâ ad eosdem inculcat ac replicat." (2 Thessal. iii. 10–12; S. Hieron., *Comment in Epist. ad Galat.* Lib. ii. cap. ii. opp. tom. vii. 381, 382, Edit. Migne.)

[2] Prof. Jowett, *Epistles of St. Paul*, i. 6.

[3] *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν δυνάμει*, 1 Thess. i. 5. "The voice of the Lord in strength" (בכח), Psalm. xxix. 4.

[4] *Ὀλιγόψυχος* occurs here only in the N. T. In the LXX. the kindred adj., verb and substant. are found several times, while in classical Greek the word appears to be nearly unknown. The exhortation of St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 14), has the air of a reminiscence of *παρακαλέσατε οἱ ὀλιγόψυχοι.* (Isaiah xxxv. 4. LXX.)

[5] Cf. the unusual collocation *ἐν φλογὶ πυρός* (2 Thess. i. 8) with *φλόγα πυρός* (Ps. xxix. 7. LXX.).

[6] *ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ* is a sort of summary of the Psalm; see LXX.

Digitized by Google

feature in the Epistles is one proof of the predominatingly Gentile origin[1] and training of the majority of the Thessalonian Church.

A more important question remains. How far have we evidence from these early pages that the words of Christ Himself, afterwards preserved in the Gospels, were known to St. Paul and presented by him in his teaching? Were words of the Johannic as well as of the synoptic type in his possession thus early? The following list may be presented as an answer:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Thess. | iii. | 3 | ... St. John xvi. 33. |
| ,, | iv. | 9 | ... ,, vi. 45; xiii. 35. |
| ,, | v. | 1, 2 | ... St. Matt. xxi. 43; xxv. 6; St. Luke xvii. 34. |
| ,, | ,, | 3 | ... St. Matt. xxiv. 8; St. Mark xiii. 8. |
| ,, | ,, | 11 | ... St. Matt. vii. 24, 25; xiv. 18; St. Luke vi. 2. |
| ,, | ,, | 13 | ... St. Mark ix. 50. |
| 2 Thess. | ii. | 1 | ... St. Luke xvii. 37. |
| ,, | ,, | 4 | St. John v. 43.[2] |
| ,, | ,, | 10 | ... St. John vii. 39; xvii. 10. |
| ,, | iii. | 3 | ... St. Matt. vi. 13. [Note also another name, of Satan (ὁ πειράζων), 1 Thess. iii. 5; S. Matt. iv. 3.] |

It will be observed that these references are to be *weighed* rather than *counted*. Among the principles taught by St. Paul in the very words of Jesus, or allusively to them, are—(1) The great law of the moral necessity of tribulation. (2) The new commandment. (3) The coming of the Day of the Lord as a thief in the night. (4) The idea of "edification," which lies at the root of two parables,[1] and of the conception of the Church.[2] (5) The bidding to be at peace among ourselves. (6) The mysterious idea of the mutual glorification of Christ in His people, and of His people in Him.

## III.

**Analysis of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.**

**i.**

**Personal.**

**Salutation (i. 1).**

**Thanksgiving for their faith, love, hope (vers. 2, 3)—**

**for the practical character of the Gospel in their case. (v. 5).**

**Their lives were imitations of his (v. 6).**

**Each of them a mould of form for Grecian Christians (v. 7).**

**Their true fame (v. 8).**

**Far and wide were known the characteristics of their spiritual life—**

**(*a*) their conversion from the well-known idolatry to the true God (v. 9).**

**(*b*) their life-long keeping of Advent, waiting for Jesus from Heaven (v. 10);**

**based upon two great principles of the Divine Government—**

**(*a*) abiding delivery by Jesus.**

**(*b*) abiding wrath of God against sin (*ibid.*).**

**Reminder of his first coming to Thessalonica with its boldness in persecution (ii. 1, 2).**

**Character of his teaching—frank, pure, honest, free from flattery (vers. 4, 5, 6).**

**Tender appeal (vers. 7–12).**

**Thanksgiving, because they received the word as God's (v. 13).**

**Their patience was on the same line with that of the persecuted Churches of Judæa; incidental prophecy (v. 14–16).**

**His intense desire to see them baffled more than once (vers. 17–20).**

**Sending of Timothy to comfort and confirm them—reminder that they had been promised tribulation (iii. 1–5).**

**Sigh of prayer TO CHRIST (v. 5).**

**Timothy's good news (v. 6);**

**consequent joy of St. Paul, and desire to see them.**

**Solemnly repeated sigh of twofold PRAYER TO CHRIST; (1) for a temporal blessing; (2) for a spiritual and eternal blessing to them (vers. 11–13).**

---

[1] Other very strong proofs of this are contained in the words, "how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God" (1 Thess. i. 9)—in the tone adopted in speaking of the *Jews* (1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, 16); and in the abstinence from all reference to the great question of the authority of the *Law*.

[2] The reference of St. Paul to our Lord's words is powerfully brought out by Chrysost. "I am come *in My Father's name*, and ye receive Me not; if another shall come in *his own name*, him ye will receive." "Once and again He says that He was *sent* and received judgment *from the Father*, and can do nothing *from Himself*. But of whom is it that Christ tells them that he will come in *his own name*? He darkly refers to the Antichrist. For he will do none of these things, nor claim to be sent by the Father, nor to have come according to His will. But everything in his whole manifestation will be contrary to that, with his tyrannical assumption of things which belong not to him, as also St. Paul saith (2 Thess. ii. 4). That is exactly 'coming in one's own name.'" (*In Joann. Homil.* xli.) The reality of St. Paul's reference to this part of our Lord's teaching should not be involved in the questionable speculations and inferences which Chrysostom hazards immediately after this passage.

[1] St. Matt. vii. 24, *seqq.*; St. Luke xiv. 28, *seqq.*

[2] St. Matt. xvi. 18.

Digitized by Google

ii.

Transitional—passing on to the great question about the departed. Love is the unseen thread of connection, the "root below the stream."[1]

1. The *false love*.

Impurity as sin against the Holy Ghost (iv. 1-8).

2. The *true love* to the living, taught by Christ, our God.

[Connected with this—

(a) Ambition to keep quiet.

(b) Honest labour, with resultant dignity and independence (vers. 9–12).

3. The *true love* of those that are asleep, with its hope that tempers the despair of the heathen (v. 13, *seqq.*).

iii.

A.

Dogmatic—fact of the Advent (iv. 13–18).

The "leading" of the dead with Jesus necessarily follows from His Death and Resurrection.

Let affection learn that *we*—i.e., those who may be alive—shall not have the advantage of the departed by one golden hour of His Presence (v. 15).

Three circumstances selected:

(a) Descent of the Lord to Judgment (v. 16).

(b) Resurrection of the holy dead (*ibid.*).

(c) Joint ascension of the dead in Christ and the living in Christ (v. 17. There is no mention here of the *General Judgment*).

This is comfort (v. 18).

B.

Time of the Advent:

The day—as they *know*—sudden (vers. 2–3).

Practical lessons:

they are sons of light and sons of day (vers. 5–9).

appointed to *salvation* (v. 9).

Mention of *salvation* leads him to *soteriology*.

(a) Salvation is through Jesus (v. 9).

(b) He died for us (v. 10).

This, too, is a comfortable word (v. 11).

iv.

General maxims:

1. Affectionate respect for the Ministerial order as such (vers. 12, 13).

2. Peacefulness (*ibid.*).

3. Special duties to special classes (v. 14)

4. Love (v. 15); joy (v. 16); prayer (v. 17); thanksgiving (v. 18); cherishing the fire of the Spirit (v. 19); respect for prophecies, but a discriminating respect (vers. 21, 22); universal and impartial abstinence from every form of evil (*ibid.*).

Solemn prayer and sweet promise (vers. 23, 24).

Request for prayer.

The Eucharistic kiss of peace (v. 26).

Adjuration to read the Epistle publicly (v. 27).

*Dominus vobiscum* (v. 28).

## IV.

The authenticity of this Epistle has scarcely been seriously impugned.

(*a*) Baur, however, has advanced certain objections.

Baur's argument is mainly grounded upon the assumption that First Thessalonians is a cento made up from other Epistles. He quotes—

1 Thess. i. 5 . . . . . 1 Cor. ii. 4.
 " " 6 . . . . . xi. 1.
 " " 8 . . . . . Rom. i. 8.
 " ii. 4, 10 . . . 1 Cor. ii. 4; iv. 3, 4; ix. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 17; v. 11; xi. 9.

But, as it is St. Paul's *habit* thus to repeat himself in undoubtedly genuine epistles, these repetitions are rather a *proof* than a *disproof* of genuineness. See Professor Jowett's masterly and convincing argument, *St. Paul's Epistles*, i. pp. 19–25.[1]

(*b*) As to external authority, early Church history records no doubt. Its reception into the Canon has ample attestation. It appears in the "Canon Muratorianus."[2] Tertullian cites it more than *twenty times*;[3] Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria upon several occasions.[4]

[1] The outline of the First Epistle is soft and undulating in the earlier chapters—Gentle memories; tender recognitions of the fruitfulness of grace among them; affectionate expressions of desire to see them; sympathy in their tribulations; an account of his present position, fill up these brief pages, which quiver with emotion (chapters i.–iii.). With chapter iv. begins a part of the letter more susceptible of regular analysis, and whose contents are sharply defined, and *notched off* by the preposition περί (περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, iv. 9–12; περὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, iv. 13–18: περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν, v. 1).

[1] It is interesting to note how many *germs* we have in the earliest Epistle afterwards expanded and matured (see especially 1 Thess. v. 8; Ephes. vi. 13–17; cf. also i. 9–11; 1 Cor. xii. 2, iv. 12; Coloss. iv. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 11; also the bare mention of "the trump of God," 1 Thess. iv. 16, with 1 Cor. xv. 52). "A similar growth is observable in the allusion to the duty of the Church to support the preachers of the Gospel when placed side by side with the larger manner in which the same subject is treated, 1 Cor. ix.; 2 Cor. xi. 8, 9; xii. 13. In all these there is the kind of difference that we should expect to find between a thought or precept repeated, and the same thought expressed for the first time in a few words." (Professor Jowett, p. 24.)

[2] "Epistolæ autem Pauli . . . ad Thessalonices *sexta*. Verum Corinthiis et Thessalonicensibus licet pro correbtione iteratur, una tamen per omnem orbem terræ ecclesia diffusa esse denoscitur" (apud Routh, *Rell. Sacræ*, i. 395, 396).

[3] See the express reference "cum *Thessalonicensibus*" and the full quotation of 1 Thess. v. 5 in Tert. *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. xxiv. and another equally explicit and lengthened quotation in the same chapter of 1 Thess. v. 1.

[4] 1 Thess. v. 23. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* vi. 1. 1 Thess. ii. 6. Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* i. 5. See full quotations in Kirchofer (*Quellensammlung des N. T. Canons*, pp. 174, 180), and *Introd. Lib. Can.* of Dr. Fr. Reithmayer (French translat.), p. 201.

Digitized by Google

# SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.



### I.

### *Analysis.*

[Much of this Epistle has already been discussed in the Introduction to the First Epistle. The Man of Sin is treated of in the Notes to Chapter II. The Apostle specially meets the two evils of *feverish fanatical excitement* in relation to the Advent; and of *disorderly mendicancy.*

i.

The Great Day, and errors about its nearness in time.

Thanksgiving for their spiritual growth, and patience in persecution (i. 1–4).

He points them to a day of impartial judgment; of refreshment to them; of everlasting punishment to the enemies of God (vers. 5–9).

Twofold end of that coming for the Saints. Christ glorified in them; they glorified in Christ (vers. 10–12).

Before the Day must come the Apostasy and Apocalypse of the Man of Sin; before that a hindrance to his Apocalypse must be removed.

| ANTICHRIST HAS, LIKE CHRIST— | ANTICHRISTIANITY HAS, LIKE CHRISTIANITY— |
|---|---|
| (a) A *coming* (v. 3). | (a) A *mystery* (v. 7). |
| (b) An *apocalypse* (ib.). | (b) An *inworking energy* (v. 7 and v. 11). |
| (c) A *designation* (v. 4). | |
| (d) A *season* (v. 9). | |
| (e) A *parousia* (v. 9). | |
| (f) *Power, signs, wonders* (ib.). | (c) A *faith* or *creed* (v. 11). |

Hindrance to be removed before Antichrist's coming. St. Paul's teaching while with them made it unnecessary to go further (vers. 5, 6).

Cause of the reception of Antichrist by his adherents moral and spiritual—not intellectual.[1]]

ii.

He has reason to thank God for them (vers. 13, 14).

Stand fast, therefore (v. 15).

Solemn prayer TO CHRIST. Sigh of supplication to Him for a *spiritual*, as the prayer in 1 Thess. iii. 11 had been for a temporal, blessing (vers. 16, 17).

iii.

Let them pray for him, specially for the spread of the Gospel (iii. 1), and for his deliverance from wicked men (v. 2).

Confidence that this will be granted (v. 3), and that they will dutifully oblige him (v. 4).

Solemn prayer TO CHRIST. [This, with ii. 16, 17, is the answering echo to the double sigh of PRAYER TO CHRIST in 1 Thess. iii. 11, 12.]

iv.

Second main subject of the Epistle. They are to discountenance all disorder (v. 6).

Appeal to his own conduct—not that he had not a right to maintenance—but for example (vers. 7, 8, 9).

Solemn exhortation to quiet work. Adjuration by CHRIST (on the same line with prayer TO HIM, vers. 10, 11, 12).

How they are to treat the disobedient, with the affectionate sternness of a loving disapprobation (v. 15).

Solemn prayer TO CHRIST—double sigh of supplication.

(a) "The Lord of Peace give you peace"—*Pax vobiscum.*

(b) *Dominus vobiscum.*

Salutation (v. 17).

Last sigh of prayer TO CHRIST (v. 17).

Grace answering to grace, as in last Epistle (1 Thess. v. 28).

### II.

The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians will require little to be said upon its authenticity. It was written while Silvanus could still be named with Paul and Timothy, and while all three were at Corinth, A.D. 53. The subscriptions which place it at *Athens* (Theodoret. Cathol. A, B); at *Rome* (Synops. St.

[1] [*v.* 10.—"Whatever, therefore, the prophecy means, those who are truly well-meaning cannot be involved in its censure."—Keble, *Stud. Sacra*, p. 235.]

Digitized by Google

Athanas.); at *Laodicea* (Pesch.) are in error. It is externally well attested (Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* III. vii. 2, quotes 2 Thess. ii. 8. Clem. Al. *Strom.* v. 5, quotes 2 Thess. iii. 1, *seqq.* St. Justin M. speaks of "the man of sin" (*Dial.* c. 110; 2 Thess. ii. 3–8; St. Polycarp quotes 2 Thess. iii. 15; ad Philipp. c. xi.).

## III.

If the view which is taken in the Introductions to these Epistles be correct, our estimate of their importance will be proportionately enhanced. We shall consider it worse than inaccurate to content ourselves with speaking in a somewhat patronizing way of their undogmatic tone, of their peculiar caressing tenderness,[1] their engrossing sentiment, and unsystematic idealism. For we shall perceive in them a precise adaptation to the wants of the Church and to the crisis of human society.

The position of Christians and of Pagan civilization at the time when these letters were written is met at every point by these earliest lines of New Testament Scripture. (1) The Church still gazed after her Lord, who had ascended about twenty years before; in the times to come she wanted clear direction and authoritative example, that she might tell those who were to come after, whether the name which she bore was derived from the first of martyrs, or from the Lord of Glory; whether her prayers were to be directed to Him as the object of her worship; whether His Death was an illustrious example or the one true sacrifice. (2) He who ascended was so to come in like manner as He had gone up into Heaven. Was the Church to expect His return with the flurried pulse of a feverish expectation, with a wild excitement shaking humanity from its steadfastness? or was the honour of that Day concerned in the reverential calmness of a quiet expectation? (3) The Christian community, in the very freedom and spirituality of the new life, might be tempted to reject all ordinances as a burden, and all ecclesiastical organization as a useless or mischievous restraint. (4) The words of the Great Teacher were unwritten for a while; they lived in memories which were quickened by the Holy Spirit. What was the relation of those words to the doctrine which was being borne by every breeze, and along a hundred different roads, to the heart of Italy and Greece, to the cities of Africa and Asia Minor? (5) The old society was sick to death with diseases which it felt to be fatal, but for which it was unable to find a name, or to apply a remedy.

If the view presented in these pages be correct, the Epistles to the Thessalonians contain precisely the answer to these questions. (1) The first writings of the New Testament Canon call Jesus "the Lord." and breathe forth repeated prayers to Him. (2) While they maintain the attitude of Advent, they warn the faithful against Pseudo-Apocalyptic fever-fits. (3) They incidentally imply an ecclesiastical organization, already compacted and recognized, which, if simple and free from intricacy, was yet solid as iron—a sacramental life already in existence which is never to fail until the end of time. (4) These Epistles disclose to those who will search for them carefully, words of Jesus—afterwards recorded in the Gospels—and those words are not introduced by way of accidental ornament, like pieces of old stained glass, which obtain a place in some window solely for their colouring, and contribute nothing to the design. They are rather like the rafters which, concealed from those who do not look for them, support the weight of the roof. (5) Finally, these earliest of the Canonical letters proclaimed to a world which was degraded by lust, and vitiated by the system of slavery, that *purity* is the first of moral virtues, and *industry* the first of

[1] This tenderness is, no doubt, peculiarly a feature of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. ii. 7, 8, 17–19; iii. 1–8; iv. 13–18; v. 14) And this softness as of a woman's heart manifested in St. Paul's first extant letter is an indication of the total change of character which had passed over him who had devastated the Church, and who had flung into prison for their faith's-sake even those whose weakness might well have been their protection. ("And haling men and *women* committed them to prison" —Acts viii. 3.)



Digitized by Google

social duties.[1] Thus they served to prepare the way for the sanctities of Christian marriage, as well as for the recognition of the dignity of free labour and commercial pursuits. A revelation, which did not come into existence amidst the pomp of philosophical disputations, or the terrors which accompanied the elder dispensation—which was truly human as well as truly Divine—found suitable expression in a letter. The recognition of free labour—so natural an accompaniment of the message which, though it came from God Himself, issued upon earth from a carpenter's shop in Nazareth, and whose most successful preacher was a tent-maker of Tarsus—has a peculiar fitness when it is found upon the earliest leaves which we possess of the NEW TESTAMENT—the Epistles to the Thessalonians.

[1] Is it fanciful to find in 2 Tim. iv. 10, a possible connection with this part of St. Paul's teaching to the Thessalonians? Exhortations to industry might easily be abused by unspiritual Christians; and Demas might find in *Thessalonica* a congenial atmosphere, where his love of the world might be indulged without absolute abandonment of the Christian community.

Digitized by Google

# THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# THESSALONIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *The Thessalonians are given to understand both how mindful of them Saint Paul was at all times in thanksgiving, and prayer:* 5 *and also how well he was persuaded of the truth and sincerity of their faith, and conversion to God.*

PAUL, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians *which is* in God the Father and *in* the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

2 We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers;

3 Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our

---

CHAP. I.—1. *Paul, &c.*] There is no Apostolic title given in this salutation, which would certainly have been assumed by a *forger*. The omission may be studiously in consonance with the character of this Epistle, which has little of the tonic severity of some others, and presents a picture drawn with the softest pencil of Christian love. ('Habet *meram dulcedinem.*'—Bengel.)

*the church of the Thessalonians . . . in God the Father and . . . the Lord Jesus Christ.*] ἐν, *pregnant and mystical*, like the "abiding" of our Lord and of St. John, denotes continuing in inner union with, perpetually living in, ensphered and encircled by. "All things in their highest aspect—churches, individuals, the actions, feelings, and words of men—are in Christ. They pass out of themselves into union with the Divine Nature" (Prof. Jowett).

2. *Grace . . . unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.*] The words after *peace* in the Text. Rec. are omitted by Lachm. (followed, as usual, by Prof. Jowett), and by Tischend.—probably wrongly. (1) The words are omitted chiefly in Alexandrian sources, and Western MSS connected with them. (2) The salutation would scarcely be very Apostolic, or indeed Christian without them. The omission would certainly be against St. Paul's invariable usage in all his letters, even in those which are addressed to individuals. (See Epistles to Timothy, Titus, Philemon.) [The omission in Coloss. i. 1 of the words καὶ κυρ. Ι. Χ., which are wanting in some MSS, can scarcely be sustained.] (See Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.' in l.). "Peace"—this is the first word which Christ spoke to His disciples after the Resurrection. Therefore, Paul everywhere says, "grace unto you and peace."—(S. Joann. Chrysost. 'in Joann. Homil.' LXXXVI.).

Cf., for general sentiment and feeling, Philipp. i. 3, 4.

**at** *our prayers;*] (ἐπί with gen. signifying "at the time of any event;" "at the point of time when it takes place." Cf. Rom. i. 10; Ephes. i. 16; Philemon v. 4, for this.

3. *work of faith, labour* (toil, Bp. Ellicott) *of love, and patience of hope.*] (1) ἔργου, (2) κόπου, (3) ὑπομονῆς, are added to (1) faith, (2) love, (3) hope. He attributes the three great Christian graces to the Thessalonians, to each of which he thoughtfully assigns its specific property and attribute. (1) "work" in sing. signifies the perpetual central *work* which faith *is* and *has*, translating itself into work from its very nature; so that he who works little has little faith. On this conception of faith, cf. our Lord's words. When the Jews ask, "What shall we do that we may work the *works* of God?" Jesus answers, with an emphatic transition from the plural to the singular, "This is the *work of God*, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent" (St. John vi. 28, 29). (2) "Labour of love," *laborious love.* "Laboriosam charitatem" (Pagnini). "*Love* is much by itself, but much more if *toilful labour* (for such is the sense) be added to it." (Grotius,

Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father:

4 Knowing, brethren [1]beloved, your election of God.

[1] Or, *beloved of God, your election.*

5 For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake.

6 And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost:

7 So that ye were ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia.

8 For from you sounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every

---

quoted by Bishop Ellicott, p. 6). We may well imagine that this was exemplified in one like the *Thessalonian* Jason (Acts xvii. 5–9). (3) (τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κ. ἡμῶν I. X.) "patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ." (A. V.) The sceond gen. may be taken as appositional with the first, "that patience which is also hope in the coming of our Lord" (Beng.). But (as the second substantive in the previous cases is attributive), more probably "your patient, hopeful waiting," i. e. "hope's patient waiting for our Lord"—patience given by the hope which has our Lord Jesus Christ for its object (cf. τὴν ὑπομ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "patient waiting for Christ," having Christ for its object. 2 Thess. iii. 5). [Hammond's paraphrase is worth quoting: "Blessing God for that obedience which your faith, that industry which your love, that enduring constancy which your hope in Christ hath wrought in you."

4. *Knowing*, **brethren beloved of** *God' your election*] ("seeing we know," or, "knowing as we do." Bp. Ellicott).

6. *And ye became followers of us.*] St. Paul is able to speak of his example as one to be *imitated* by all his spiritual children, and to which they were bound to conform (cf. Philipp. iii. 17, iv. 9). The manner in which they became imitators of the Lord is brought out in what follows: "Joy amid *suffering* and *affliction* is the *tertium comparationis.*" (Bp. Ellicott.)

7. *So that ye were* **ensamples.**] So A. V. rightly. (1) While there is considerable authority both for singular and plural (τύπον and τύπους), the balance is in favour of Text. Rec. (א A, C), so most Fathers. Bp. Ellicott admits that the singular has "less external authority." (The versions, however, are rather *for* it,—e. g. "ita ut facti sitis *forma* omnibus." Vulg.). As to the usage and meaning—Τύπος is a person or thing by which is prefigured that which, under the moulding influence of the Divine purpose, some other thing or person will be or ought to be. But the usage of the N. T. is that when this is predicated of *many*, the word should be in the *plural.* (1 Cor. x. 6; 1 St. Peter v. 4). When it is predicated of *one*, the *singular* is used, even with the *plural* pronoun *we*, where *we* is evidently *singular* in *meaning.* (2 Thessal. iii. 9; Philipp. iii. 17; cf. Rom. v. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Titus ii. 7.) Many, collectively called τύπος, would involve the technical Biblical sense of *type.* Nor are the Thessalonians here looked upon as *one* abstract *collective body*, to which this term might be properly applied. They are spoken of not exactly as a *Church*, but as individuals and in the concrete ('ye,' ver. 6; 'ye,' ver. 7; 'from you' . . . 'your faith,' ver. 8). Calvin has grasped the idea with great clearness. "The *plural*, in my judgment, is much more fully expressive than if St. Paul had said that the Church of the Thessalonians, as a *body*, was proposed for imitation. The sense really is, that there were in that Church as *many examples* (τύποι) as individuals." They became so many "*moulds* of *form*" for the Christian life. (See Reiche, 'Comm. Crit. on N. T.' ii. 324.)

8. *For from you sounded out the word of the Lord.*] ἐξήχηται. "Forth from you, by the fame which has gone abroad, the word is propagated" (Grimm, 'Lex. N. T.'; cf. de Wette, ad loc.)—made itself felt and heard, as it were, with the sound of a trumpet. Note the picturesque force of the perfect; the blast hangs on the air as the result of the trumpet having been blown. [For the word see ἦχον ἐξήχησαν, הָמוֹן, Joel iii. 14, LXX. For probable geographical and historical allusions, see the Introduction to the Epistle.]

*not only in Macedonia and Achaia.*] Macedonia, where you are, and Achaia, where I am.

8, 9. *so that we need not to speak any thing, for they themselves show* **concerning** *us.*] Their conversion, and corresponding change of character was known far and near. Those who might have rather been expected to hear of it from the agent in so great a change, come *on their own account*, and tell us without being led to it. [For this use

Digitized by Google

place your faith to Godward is spread abroad; so that we need not to speak any thing.

9 For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God;

10 And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, *even* Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.

---

of αὐτός cf. "I say not unto you that I will pray the Father for you; for the *Father Himself* (αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ) loveth you." St. John xvi. 26, 27.]

*how ye turned once for all* (ἐπεστρέψατε) *to Him who is God from* **the idols**, i. e. *of which ye know* (ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων), to make your life-long service to a God who is Living and Very God. On the distinction between ἀληθής, the *true* as opposed to the mendacious, and ἀληθινός, the *very* as opposed to the shadowy—that in which the idea is realised, as opposed to that in which it is only partially exhibited, see infra on 1 St. John. [On St. John i. 9, Mr. Keble observes, "*True* ἀληθινός), opposed, not to the false, but to the shadowy and typical. A deep lesson attaches to the word in this application of it. Such phrases as "the True Light," "the True Bread," "the True Vine," in the Gospel, in St. Luke, "the True riches," and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "the true Tabernacle," and "holy places, which are figures of the True," &c.—'Studia Sacra,' pp. 29, 30.] See also 2 Chron. xv. 3. (οὐ Θεῷ ἀληθινῷ, LXX.) Great words, as addressed at that date to men and women who might daily look upon Olympus! Cf. the antithesis with which S. John closes his First Epistle—'This is the Very God' (ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, v. 20). Then, with a sigh and a shudder, "Keep yourselves from the idols' (ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, v. 21). "There is nothing more essential to anything than the life thereof—and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but the living. 'The Lord He is the true God, He is the living God.'" (Jerem. xi. 10; 1 Thessal. i. 9). Pearson on the Creed, Part I. 57. For Christ as the living God, see S. John v. 26, vi. 57.

**10.** *And to wait for His Son from heaven.*] ἀναμένειν—ἀνά in comp. signifies "*tending to an end*" (Bretsch. Lex. Man.' p. 23); hence a notion of *patience* and *confidence* is implied in ἀνα-μένω (Grimm, 'Lex. N. T.' p. 26). It has been said to be remarkable that St. Paul should here make "the *essence of the Gospel* consist, not in the belief in Christ, nor in taking up His cross, but in the hope of His coming again." But St. Paul does not give us the slightest ground for thinking that he is here defining "the essence of the Gospel." If he were so defining, surely the previous clause, "to continue doing service to a Living and Very God," would have a right to be included. With St. Paul, as with all great Christian thinkers, different aspects of the Gospel will acquire especial importance at different times. Lines and words will be more or less accentuated from time to time. The seasons of the Christian year are represented variously in St. Paul's writings. The breath of Advent-tide blows about the first Epistle to the Thessalonians. Bp. Ellicott beautifully says, "If joy be said to be the key-note of the Epistle to the Philippians (iii. 1), hope may truly be termed that of the present Epistle"—p. 14.

*Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.*] The translation of the A. V. is here doubly unhappy. There is no tinge either of the past in the first participle (ῥυόμενον), or of the future in the second (ἐρχομένης). Both are present in the strictest sense. Each conveys a fixed principle of God's government. Each almost exactly corresponds to the heading of a chapter in Bishop Butler's 'Analogy'—"Jesus, who is ever delivering" expresses "the particular *system* of Christianity, the appointment of a Mediator." "The wrath which is ever coming," answers to the permanent "*government* of God by punishments"—('Analogy,' Part II., chap. v.; Part I., chap. ii.). For "the wrath which is coming," cf. the terribly brief and emphatic words—"The wrath is coming" (Coloss. iii. 6).

*delivering.*] ῥυόμενον. Our Lord is very emphatically spoken of as "the Deliverer" ὁ ῥυόμενος, Rom. xi. 26. This is the translation of גּוֹאֵל (gōēl), Isaiah lix. 20, LXX. The Greek brings in a shade of thought which is not in the original word: (1) "drawing to oneself;" hence (2) rescuing (Rom. vii. 24, xi. 26, xv. 31; 2 Cor. i. 10; Coloss. i. 13; 2 Thessal. iii. 2; 2 Tim. iii. 11, iv. 17, 18. See Dean Vaughan, St. Paul's Epistle to Romans, p. 145). This ever present deliverance *implies* a past. He redeemed us once for all; He is ever delivering us. For redemption and deliverance, cf. Psalm cvii. 2 . . . 6. The LXX in this place, however, have given a translation in v. 2, which differs from that in Isaiah lix. 10.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER II.

1 *In what manner the gospel was brought and preached to the Thessalonians, and in what sort also they received it.* 18 *A reason is rendered both why Saint Paul was so long absent from them, and also why he was so desirous to see them.*

FOR yourselves, brethren, know our entrance in unto you, that it was not in vain:

2 But even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with much contention.

3 For our exhortation *was* not of deceit, nor of uncleanness, nor in guile:

4 But as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts.

5 For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloke of covetousness; God *is* witness:

6 Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor *yet* of others, when we might have [1]been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ.

[1] Or, *used authority.*

---

CHAP. II.—**2.** *we were bold in our God.*] Compare this with "speaking boldly in the Name of the Lord." (Acts ix. 29).

*with much contention.*] Inward emotion and struggle, as well as outward, is included in ἀγῶν. Cf. Coloss. ii. 1.

**3.** *For our exhortation.*] (παράκλησις.) The whole Gospel preaching and message is so called, as permeated by, and living in, an atmosphere of gentle, soothing affection. Religion has been defined as "morality tinctured by emotion." Much more truly is the whole Gospel a system "tinctured by emotion," *i. e.* a παράκλησις. Hence two different shades of meaning are blended in the word. As addressed to the careless, slothful, tempted, fallen, it is *exhortation;* as addressed to the sad and seeking it is *solace* and *comfort.* It is the Gospel exhortation, which is never without a certain soothing, sympathetic sweetness.

*was* [**is**] *not* **from** *deceit, nor* **from** *uncleanness, nor in guile.*] The *origin and source from* which it was derived and uttered was not deception nor impurity (οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης, οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, "not **from** deceit, nor **from** uncleanness), nor was it conceived and cradled, living and moving, in a congenial atmosphere of guile" (ἐν δόλῳ). A good illustration of "in guile" will be found in the complicated network of lying in which Jacob became entangled (Genesis xxvii. 19). "Many passages of the N. T. lead us to suppose that there existed in the age of the Apostles a connexion between the form of spirituality and licentiousness. Of this St. Paul declares his innocence, and with it he elsewhere upbraids the false teachers." (Prof. Jowett, 'St. Paul's Epistles,' i. 48).

**4.** *But* **according as we have** *been* **approved** *of God.*] (δεδοκιμάσμεθα).

*pleasing men.*] On this word, and the notion of excessive obsequiousness which underlies it, see on Coloss. iii. 22).

Which **approveth.** The same word as that which occurs above at the beginning of the verse. The different translations of this word in the A. V. ("*were allowed,*" "*trieth*") are unfortunate.

**5.** "We did not use words such as flattery uses, or pretexts such as avarice uses" (Prof. Jowett). We did not allow ourselves to be drawn into an atmosphere of perpetual flattery in speech, nor into a long deception arising from self-seeking.

**6.** *Nor* **were we seeking** *glory out* **of men** *as its source, nor* **from you,** nor **from others,** *as its particular occasion* (ἐξ ἀνθρώπων . . . ἀφ' ὑμῶν . . . ἀπ' ἄλλων) — ἐξ signifies "motion from *within* an object (*intrinsecus*), ἀπό, motion from *the surface* of an object." (Donaldson, 'Gr. Gr.,' 506.) It is true that the difference is often scarcely perceptible, but the prepositions are here used with an antithesis which is accentuated by the twice repeated ἀπό.—On vain-glory, with a direct quotation of this verse, see the powerful passage of St. Chrysost. 'in Joann. Homil.' iii., 5, 6.

*a cloke of covetousness, God is witness.*] "Our habitual state, the condition under which we became, was not one of that perpetual pretext which covetousness is wont to use." "A cloak of covetousness; for who shameth not to wear it outwardly? No man will profess himself covetous; but he will for very shame cast as handsome a cloak over it as he can (*frugality*, some cloak or other), to hide the filthiness of it from sight of others. 'God is witness.' He called God to be his compurgator, which sure he would not do, *nisi dignus*

Digitized by Google

7 But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children:

8 So being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us.

9 For ye remember, brethren, our labour and travail: for labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God.

10 Ye *are* witnesses, and God *also*, how holily and justly and un-

---

*vindice nodus.*" (Bp. Sanderson, Sermons, p. 419.)

7. *But we were gentle among you.*] A. V., after Text. Rec. For ἤπιοι many MSS. (ℵ B C D, κ.τ.λ.) read νήπιοι, "babes." The reading has so much external support that we would not venture to describe it, with Reiche, as "*lectio absurda.*" But it might not be quite worthy of the Apostle's dignity so to speak of himself; nor, as it would appear, would such a use of the word 'babes' be at all in accordance with his practice. It would seem as if the spiritually infirm, the morally and intellectually weak, were thus described by St. Paul. (Cf. "teacher of *babes*," Rom. ii. 20; "*babes* in Christ," 1 Cor. iii. 1; "we, when we were *babes*," Galat. iv. 3; "that we be no more *babes*," Ephes. iv. 14; every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a *babe*," Hebrews v. 13). "In malice be *ye babes*" (τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, 1 Cor. xiv. 20), is indeed an exception; but the passage has a subtle play on the good and bad senses of childhood, on *childishness* and *childlikeness* Besides the usage of the word, St. Paul, in the context, presents himself and the Thessalonians in an aspect which would precisely reverse, and by implication contradict (see Additional Note at end of chapter), the figure of babyhood applied to himself. *They* are the *babes; he* is the τροφὸς, "*mother*, who is also a nurse."

*as a nurse cherisheth her children.*] As **a nursing mother** cherisheth **her own** children.

8. *being affectionately desirous of you.*] (See Additional Note at close of the chapter).

*because ye* **became** *dear to us.*]

9. *For ye remember our* **toil** *and travail*, **working** *night and day,*] The narrative in the Acts, if very strictly pressed, might lead us to suppose that St. Paul had only spent at Thessalonica 27 days at the utmost, perhaps only 21 or 22 (Acts xvii. 1, 2, 10). To some the present passage has accordingly appeared to present considerable difficulties. The narrative in Acts, however, does not absolutely demand such narrow limits of time. And two circumstances seem to require its extension—the conversion of many idolaters (1 Thessal. i. 9), and his own express statement, that he remained long enough in Thessalonica to receive assistance, 'once and again' from Philippi. (Philipp. iv. 16). (See Canon Cook, 'Acts of Apostles,' p. 205.) In any case, the spectacle of such an one as St. Paul so working, even for something less than a month, would be a memorable one—a thing to attract attention, and to be long remembered and discussed. This would especially be the case in the Church of Thessalonica. A shopkeeping and industrial community would instinctively know whether such an exhibition was a piece of charlatanism or a reality. Even if St. Paul's stay was cut short by a riot, they might be perfectly aware whether those few weeks were a fair representation of the frame and mould of his general life. It is certainly strange to think how far the idea which we instinctively form of the great Apostle, as one utterly absorbed in theological thought or seraphic devotion, when not employed in preaching or missionary work, must be modified by such a passage as this. The language here used about "working night and day" would show that in Thessalonica, at least, *one* unbroken day in the week only could be undividedly given to directly Apostolic labour. It is vain to conjecture how much time may have been at his disposal upon the other days of the week. It has been added to the list of St. Paul's difficulties that he thus worked manually "at an age when the bodily frame refuses to perform a new office." This is surely not so. Men of station and education among the Jews diligently learned trades. The same obligation has been imposed by custom upon persons even of royal birth in different nations and countries. Eginhard tells us that Charlemagne had his sons taught mechanic trades, his daughters spinning and weaving. Each member of the Prussian Royal Family, at the present time, is apprenticed, and enters into a guild of tradesmen. St. Paul's motives in continuing to work were three: (1) *independence*, the being able to take what has been ingeniously called "a lay position"; (2) *example* (2 Thess. iii. 8, 9); (3) *charity*, having something to give in alms (Acts xx. 34).

Digitized by Google

blameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe:

11 As ye know how we exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you, as a father *doth* his children,

12 That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory.

13 For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received *it* not *as* the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.

14 For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judæa are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they *have* of the Jews:

15 Who both killed the Lord

---

**10.** *to you that believe*] This is accused of being "without emphasis," "a pointless word." Is it not rather very pointed? '*For you* that *believe*,'—although it may not always have seemed so to others.

**11, 12.** (1) *exhorted*; (2) *comforted*; (3) *charged*. (1) παρακαλοῦντες; (2) παραμυθούμενοι ;(3) μαρτυρούμενοι. *Exhorting, comforting, beseeching*. Cranmer (quoted by Bp. Ellicott). This somewhat difficult passage is thus translated by Bp. Ellicott. "Even as you know how in regard of every one of you we *did so*, as a father towards his own children; exhorting you and encouraging you. and testifying that ye should walk worthy of God." (Bp. Ellicott, 'Epp. to Thess.' p. 145.)

*his kingdom and glory*] (τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν). The article refers to both substantives, and the pronoun is most emphatic, "that which is at once the kingdom and glory of His own Self." "By so accepting it, they believed it ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of St. Paul (Pearson on Creed, Article 1, p. 19), cf. 2 Thess. i. 10"—The gen. signifies whose *subject*, not whose *author* is God.

*His kingdom.*] The Christians, dragged from Jason's house, were charged before the politarchs of Thessalonica, with "doing contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there was a different King, Jesus" (Acts xvii. 2). It has been inferred that St. Paul gave peculiar prominence to this aspect of our Lord's offices—to His kingdom—in teaching at Thessalonica. This verse and 2 Thessalonians i. 5, have been appealed to in confirmation. But these Epistles give little support to the idea. The conception of the Kingdom is not so prominent in either of these letters, as, *e.g.*, in 1 Corinthians or Galatians. It is scarcely warrantable then to find in these two verses any special illustration of the history (Acts xvii. 11), or of the prophecy of the Man of Sin (2 Thess. ii.).

**13.** That when ye received a word of hearing (preached word) from us, which is yet a word of God (παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ) ("verbum auctoritatis Dei."—Vulg.), ye accepted, not a word of man, but, as it is truly, a word of God."

*of the churches of God . . . in Judæa.*] St. Paul speaks of "churches" in one country or city, yet the same churches or congregations are *collectively one*. Cf. "churches" 1 Cor. xiv. 34; with "church" (1 Cor. i. 2.) See Pearson, Art. IX.

**14.** *became followers.*] *Imitators.*

*of your own countrymen*] συμφυλέται. The unconverted Jews in Thessalonica, of whose envy and violence we are told so vividly by St. Luke (Acts xvii. 5, 11, 13)—the *Jewish* inhabitants of Macedonia, more especially of Thessalonica.

**15.** *killed the Lord Jesus.*] The title "the Lord" here is not simply one of usual *reverence*. There is an undertone of horror, indignation, and realization of their guilt in it. "They killed the *Lord* Jesus,"—Him, who as their Master, they were bound to serve. The title is an addition to their guilt; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8.

*and their own prophets.*] Several uncial manuscripts (א, A, B, D) and modern critics (Lachm., followed by Prof. Jowett, Tischend., Bp. Ellicott) omit the ἰδίους in τοὺς ἰδίους προφήτας of the Text. Rec. But the word is not without good external attestation, and it adds much force to the Apostle's argument here. (1) It shows the reckless sanguinary unbelief of the Jews in murdering the prophets. Why, these prophets, the flower and glory of their race, were *their very own!* (2) It adds peculiar vividness to the parallel presented by the Thessalonian Christians, who were persecuted by their *own* brethren and fellow-countrymen. v. 14). Two reasons may have led to its omission. It might have seemed somewhat derogatory to the prophets to be described as peculiarly and exclusively *Jewish*. It has also been suggested that a scruple

Digitized by Google

Jesus, and their own prophets, and have [1]persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men:

16 Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.

17 But we, brethren, being taken from you for a short time in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see your face with great desire.

[1] Or, *chased us out.*

---

might have occurred to the scribe as to the correctness in Greek of ἴδιος thus used (Reiche). For *expression* cf. τις . . . ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης, Titus i. 12; for *thought*, cf. S. Matt. v. 12, xxiii. 31. [Tertullian accuses Marcion of having interpolated "their own" here, to suit his peculiar doctrine. Such charges were too often made without evidence. If Marcion, or some one else, who held that the Old Testament prophets had nothing to do with Christians, had interpolated the word, it would not have been received into so many orthodox books.]

*have persecuted us.*] (ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξάντων.) Note the ἐκ—they **chased us out** by persecution.

*they please not God, and are contrary to all men.*] Μή, the subjective negative; they are of a class of whom we may conceive that they are not pleasing to God. St. Paul had had but too many opportunities of seeing the bearing of his countrymen to the rest of the world, and the opinion entertained of them. Alternately fiercely credulous (*credat Judæus Apelles*), and fiercely incredulous; wanting in flexibility, urbanity, refinement, kindness (*ad fontes solos deducere verpos*); their furious spirit of riot, their savagely-repulsive nationality (*adversus omnes alios hostile odium*, Tacit. 'Hist.' v. 5), their bitter and insolent contempt, presented itself to St. Paul almost as it did to Juvenal and Tacitus.

16. *Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved.*] This, in the Apostle's thought, is a very special instance of their "adversus omnes alios hostile odium."

*to fill up their sins.*] (εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι.) "*Object* and *result* seem to be blended together in the εἰς; a double necessity in themselves, and in the course of events meeting in one" (Prof. Jowett). For the thought, as well as the language cf. οὔπω ἀναπεπλήρωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι κ.τ.λ. "The sins of the Amorites are not yet *filled up*." (Gen. xv. 16, LXX.)

*alway.*] "*Before, at the time of*, and *after* Christ" (Prof. Jowett.)

*but* **the wrath** *is come upon them.*] On "**the wrath**," cf. supra on 1 Thess. i. 10; Coloss. iii. 6.

*to the uttermost.*] εἰς τέλος has three possible meanings: (1) *Even to the end* of anything, e.g. of sufferings (St. Matt. x. 22, 24; St. Mark xiii. 13). (2) *At last* (St. Luke xviii. 5; St. John xiii. 1). (3) So as to bring in the end, i.e. *utter destruction*, (לְכָלָה "would not *destroy him altogether*,") 2 Chron. xii. 3; עַד־לְכַלֵּה ("until they had *utterly destroyed them all*," 2 Chron. xxxi. 1), "ad interitum, ita ut intereat, *funditus, prorsus*." (Ἀπολέσαι εἰς τέλος, Amos ix. 8). See Grimm, 'Lex. N. T.' Bretscnn. 'Lex. Man.' s. v. τέλος. That bitter end! ("tristis exitus," Beng.). This Epistle was probably written at the close of A.D. 52, or the beginning of A.D. 53, in the early months of St. Paul's stay of a year and a half at Corinth (Acts xviii. 11). About four years before, at the Paschal feast, a terrible riot occurred, in which, some historians say, 30,000 Jews were slain. This passage has been adduced as evidence that the Epistle was written *after* the siege of Jerusalem. But the language of "ex post facto" prophecy would have been more definite and more amplified. These brief words have the large generality, the indefinite horror and grandeur, of a true prophetic burden.

"The Jews, for stoning the prophet—but most of all for crucifying the Son of God—brought blood-guiltiness, not only upon themselves (St. Matthew xxvii. 25). The 'wrath of God,' therefore, coming upon them to the uttermost, and abiding upon their posterity even to this day, wherever they still remain, scattered almost everywhere." (Bishop Sanderson, Sermon, p. 190.) .

17. *being taken from you.*] ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν. Bp. Ellicott happily remarks, "In this expressive comparison the ἀπό (reiterated before the pronoun) serves to mark the idea of *separation*, and the term ὀρφανός, ὀρφανίζω, the feeling of desolation and *bereavement* which the separation involved." [No idea, either of *orphanhood* or of *childlessness* is necessarily implied.] Bp. Ellicott well suggests "having been torn from you," as the translation ("*desolati a vobis ad tempus horæ*," Vulg.).

18. There is an agent as *personal* as the *will* of man. "*We* **willed** to have come unto you, but *Satan* hindered **us.**"

Digitized by Google

18 Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us.

19 For what *is* our hope, or joy, or crown of [1]rejoicing? *Are* not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?

20 For ye are our glory and joy.

1 Or, glorying

He is often the real factor in history, acting through wicked men, when his name is not mentioned (see *e.g.* Acts xvii. 13). The passage is dogmatically imported as a "dictum probans" for the personality of Satan.

**19.** *or crown of rejoicing.*] (See Additional Note at end of the chapter.)

*at His coming.*] "His hope extends even to that." (Bengel).

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 7, 8, 19.

**7.** Prof. Jowett here (as usual) follows Lachmann. He considers that the "*confusion* which it occasions in the image is rather in favour of its genuineness than otherwise, as such confusions occur elsewhere." It is, indeed, true that we do not always find a pedantic and elaborate accuracy in all the details of St. Paul's metaphor; but *self-contradiction* is something more than "confusion." The two instances given from the present Epistle are surely unhappy, to say the least. (1) 1 Thess. v. 2–4, where he reads, "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief (κλέπτης) in the night," v. 2: "that that day shall overtake you as *thieves*" (κλέπτας, v. 4.) But the Text. Rec. has, in all probability, the right reading in v. 4, "as a *thief*" (κλέπτης). (2) πρόσωπον and προσώπῳ (1 Thess. ii. 17). But here is no "confusion" of metaphor—only a very slightly varied shade of meaning in the two words, if, indeed, that. It may be added that ἤπιος would seem to be a word peculiarly appropriate to *parental tenderness;* it is cognate to ἔπος, εἰπῶν. [ἤπιος (cognate cum ἔπος, εἰπεῖν) patrum proprium est.

. . . πατὴρ δ' ὣς ἤπιος ἦεν. Hom. Odyss. ii. 47.

Herod. ii. 4. 1.—ἤπιος.—Reiche, 'Com. Crit.' ii. p. 325, note *.]

It should be added that the Vulgate translates, "facti sumus *parvuli* in medio vestrum, tanquam si nutrix foveat filios suos" (Cod. Amiat.). If this reading is accepted after all, we may quote the words of the eloquent Bishop of Orleans. "The preacher, after the example of St. Paul, makes himself all to all, accommodates himself to them, sometimes even has something of the bright gaiety of an infant (*s'égaie même comme un enfant, tanquam parvulus*), or of the tenderness of a nursing mother." ('Entretiens sur la Préd. Pop.' p. 159.)

**8.** The word ἱμειρόμενοι of the Text. Rec. appears as ὁμειρόμενοι in a great number of MSS. (ℵ A, B, D, E, F, G.) No doubt ὁμειρόμ., with such a weight of attestation, must have been the reading. But it seems certain that ὁμειρόμ. is never found in Greek. It is not quite to the point here to appeal to St. Paul's occasional habit of coining words. A critic has observed, in speaking of one of St. Paul's coinages, "Whichever of the two words (παραβουλευσάμενος, or παραβολευσάμενος, Philipp. ii. 30) St. Paul may have written, there is no dispute among scholars that he first invented it; it is quite clear that he did the same thing in other cases also. But we may be sure that either word was formed fairly, *according to the* general rules of the *Greek language*, which St. Paul *religiously observes*, even when moulding new terms out of old" (Reiche, 'Comm. Crit ii. 223). If the derivation given by some were correct (from ὁμοῦ and εἴρω, to *twine* or *wreathe*, "interweaving ourselves, as it were, with you," "connecting ourselves with your lives," the word should have a different form (ὁμηρεῖσθαι, Winer, § xii. 4) and should govern a *dative*, not, as here, a *genitive*. Reiche concludes his able argument by the position that ἱμειρόμενοι need not be an exclusively poetical word, and that the other form must have been taken down wrongly from a peculiarity of pronunciation or by a slip of the pen.

**19.** (στέφανος). Some eminent Biblical critics have drawn a distinction, invariable, as they consider, between στέφανος and διάδημα: the first being ever the "chaplet of victory," the latter "the diadem of royalty." It may, however, be seriously questioned, with the LXX before us, whether it is not used by St. Paul simply with the idea of ornament or dignity, without any notion of victory. It is so far from being the case that στέφανος is *never* used of "royal diadem," that in the LXX it constantly stands for עֲטָרָה, crown royal.[1] The same mean-

Digitized by Google

ing follows στέφανος in the N. T. also. The idea of the crown of thorns in the Crucifixion is not merely a *wreath* of a certain material for the infliction of pain, but a *caricature* of one of the chief outward *insignia* of kingship.[2] The word στέφανος, again, is used in the Apocalypse of the kingly priests, who are exhibited with the special symbols of their *royalty* as well as of their *priesthood*.[3] Nor is this all. The same word στέφανος is used (1) of the crown upon the head of the Royal Victor (Apoc. vi. 2); (2) of the crown upon the head of the Church (στέφ. ἀστέρων, xii. 1); (3) of the golden crown upon the head of the Son of Man (xiv. 14). It is transferred to whatever is an ornament of noble dignity to a man, which bestows upon him any shadow or reflection of *royalty*. (Job xix. 9; Prov. xii. 4, κ.τ.λ.). The idea is then, perhaps, *neither* "victory," *nor* "a chaplet, as distinguished from a royal diadem;" but ornament, distinction, primarily in connection with, and with allusion to, royalty. For some beautiful illustrations of the way in which "my crown" passed, as an almost *term. tech.*, into ecclesiastical language signifying "my flock," or "my people," when used by bishops or priests, see Corn. à Lap. (tom. xix. p. 57). [The writer must be contented to refer to the valuable note upon Philipp. iv. 1, which, unfortunately, he was unable to consult in time to render its conclusions available.]

## CHAPTER III.

1 *Saint Paul testifieth his great love to the Thessalonians, partly by sending Timothy unto them to strengthen and comfort them: partly by rejoicing in their well doing:* 10 *and partly by praying for them, and desiring a safe coming unto them.*

WHEREFORE when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone;

2 And sent Timotheus, our brother, and minister of God, and our fellowlabourer in the gospel of

CHAP. III.—1. *when we could no longer forbear.*] Note the *subjective* tinge of the negative μηκέτι—"feeling that we could no longer"—in accordance with the gently emotional tone of the passage.

*we thought it good.*] εὐδοκήσαμεν. There is a subtle play of feeling in the whole texture of these words. On the one hand, *sadness* ("to be *left*"—"*alone in Athens*"), on the other hand, a bright and tender *pleasure*, beyond resignation, a consent that was not extorted ("we were *well pleased*"). Grotius brings out well the mingled play of feeling. "*Triste* hoc, sed tamen *libenter*, vestri causâ."

*to be* **left behind.**] (καταλειφθῆναι.) has often about it a tinge of *desertion* and *forlornness* (cf. of leaving *father and mother*, St. Matt. xix. 5; St. Mark x. 7; Ephes. v. 13, from Gen. ii. 24, LXX; *the sheep* in the wilderness, St. Luke xv. 4; the *preaching of the word*, Acts vi. 2. In the O. T., of one *leaving* wife or children by death, Deut. xxviii. 54; Prov. xx. 7 in LXX; cf. St. Mark xii. 19; St. Luke xx. 31. The word is suffused with the sadness which abides after a farewell.

*at Athens alone.*] *alone*, standing forcibly last. Upon the departure of Timothy, Paul and Silvanus felt themselves to be indeed alone. "Alone in London" has become a proverb. But there was something more to one like St. Paul in a place like Athens, the city which was so beautiful, but so far from God. Note that it is a mistake to suppose (with the subscription, Theod. &c.) that St. Paul wrote this Epistle from Athens. The expressions in this verse neither prove that St. Paul wrote from thence, nor indicate in what circumstances he wrote. He only confirms what he had said of his anxious desire to visit them (*supra*, ii. 18), by expressing to the Thessalonians that even during his stay at Athens he had supremely desired to see them again, and to hear tidings of them. (See Wieseler, 'Chron. de Apost.' pp. 241, 257; Reithmayer, 'Introd. Sac. Canon.' (French translat. p. 200).

*our brother, and minister of God* (διάκονον), *and our fellow-labourer in the gospel*

[1] When David takes the king's *crown* from the Ammonite monarch, ἔλαβε τὸν στέφανον τοῦ βασ. (2 Sam. xii. 30). In a great psalm of Messiah's royalty "Thou hast placed upon his head a *crown*, στέφανον ἐκ λίθου τιμίου (Ps. xvi. 3). So of Mordecai's *royal* state, Esther viii. 15. Cf. Zechar. vi. 11, 14.

[2] στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, St. Matt. xxvii. 29; ἀκάνθινον στέφανον, St. Mark xv. 17; στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, St. John xix. 2.

[3] τοὺς εἴκ. τέσσ. πρεσβυτέρους . . . περιβεβλημένους ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν στεφάνους χρυσοῦς, Apoc. iv. 4. Cf. βαλοῦσι τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ., v. 10. See also ix. 7.

Digitized by Google

Christ, to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith:

3 That no man should be moved by these afflictions: for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto.

4 For verily, when we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer tribulation; even as it came to pass, and ye know.

5 For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain.

6 But now when Timotheus came

---

*of Christ.*] A. V., Text. Rec., "our brother and *fellow-worker* with God (συνεργὸν) in the Gospel of Christ" Bp. Ellicott, Lachm., and Tischend.). *External* evidence is rather in favour of the Text. Rec. There is no useless redundancy about it, but a real point in each attribute of praise given to Timothy. "Our brother" indicates that he is their *associate* in a common faith, with an additional thought of *fraternal affection*. His being a 'Minister of God' indicates his *laborious office* of preaching, and that with a special call and authority from *God* (cf. for junction of 'brother' and 'minister' what is said of Tychicus, Eph. vi. 21). To these two predicates is added yet another: "our fellow-labourer," our assistant in proclaiming the Gospel (cf. Philipp. ii. 25). This ungrudging praise is heaped upon Timothy, both to promote confidence in his messenger, and with a tender reference to the sacrifice which he was making in giving up the society of such a friend and helper.

**2, 3.** *to comfort you concerning your faith; that no man should be moved.*] A. V. Rather, "to **exhort** you on **behalf** of your faith, that no man," κ.τ.λ. (Bp. Ellicott). The construction is as follows: "to exhort you on **behalf** of your faith," (παρακάλεσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν) to recommend you the following course, viz., the not yielding to the idea of any of you being shaken. (See Note at end of the chapter.)

**3.** *That no man should be moved.*] (μηδένα σαίνεσθαι.) This verb literally means "to wag the tail"—hence (1) to flatter, or fawn upon; (2) to have the mind moved, whether in the direction of pleasure or of terror, in a manner unworthy of the dignity of Christian manhood.

*for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto.*] "Yourselves" without being told by me or by others. On this accentuated use of αὐτός, see note *supra* on 1 Thess. i. 9. Why did they *know* this? Because St. Paul had told them of Christ's saying. (St. John xvi. 33.)

*appointed thereunto.*] Κεῖμαι with εἰς and accusative of the end designated, signifies destined and fixed by the counsel of God (cf. "This child is *set for*;" povidentially destined to bring about (St. Luke ii. 34). While it may be true that the Apostle was speaking with special reference to himself (Est.), it should yet be remembered that affliction is, so to speak, the Christian's natural condition. ("Let *all Christians* hear this."—Theophyl. in loc.). "The Gospel is the covenant of the Cross" (Hamm.). It is the Saviour's *promise* (St. John xvi. 33). When He addressed St. Paul through Ananias, He told His servant not how great things he was to do, but how much to suffer (Acts ix. 16.) It is, according to the Apostle, the perpetual law of His kingdom; it is put in the form of a maxim and a quotation that "through many tribulations it is *morally necessary for us* to enter into the kingdom of God." (Acts xiv. 22; cf. 2 Tim. iii. 12). Temporal prosperity is the blessing of the old Covenant. Yet "the pencil of the Holy Ghost laboureth" in describing the sorrows rather than the joys of Job, and the Psalter is a manual for sorrowers (see Job xvi.; Lamentat. iii. 1-33, κ.τ.λ.). Cornel. à Lap. quotes a noble passage from Seneca; ("Ecce, par Deo dignus vir fortis cum malâ fortunâ compositus; ecce, spectaculum Deo dignum. Dicant hi ergo, dignissimi sumus Deo in quibus experiretur quantum humana natura pati posset.") But, surely, with his self-consciousness and pride in the grandeur of human endurance, Seneca affords rather a *contrast* to, than an illustration of, St. Paul.

**4.** *For . . . we told you before that we should suffer tribulation.*] There is something prophetic in being in possession of a great general law, like that at the close of ver. 3. To *this* he probably refers in "*for* we *told you before*" rather than to particular troubles and persecutions. They did, however, come, and that speedily (Acts xvii. 4, 5-13).

**5.** *For this cause, when I could no longer forbear.*] The Apostle resumes with the opening words of ver. 1, "Wherefore when we could no longer forbear."

*the tempter.*] ὁ πειράζων, Satan (*supra*, ii. 18). The same title is given to him by St. Matthew (iv. 3).

*our labour be in vain.*] "It is a sad thing to lose spiritual labour."

**6.** Writing after Timothy's arrival, his

Digitized by Google

GENERAL LIBRARY University of MICHIGAN

from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and charity, and that ye have good remembrance of us always, desiring greatly to see us, as we also *to see* you:

7 Therefore, brethren, we were comforted over you in all our affliction and distress by your faith:

8 For now we [a]live, if ye stand fast in the Lord.

[a] Rom. 7. 9.

9 For what thanks can we render to God again for you, for all the joy wherewith we joy for your sakes before our God;

10 Night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your face, and might perfect that which is lacking in your faith?

11 Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, [1]direct our way unto you.

[1] Or, *guide.*

12 And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all *men*, even as we *do* toward you:

13 To the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.

---

style here quivers with joy ("recenti gaudio, tenerrimo animo," Beng.)

*and brought us the* **good tidings** *of your faith and love.*] (*εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν.*) Εὐαγγ. is a "magnificent participle" (as Bengel says), not without a reference to *the* "good news." (See *εὐαγγηλισάμην δικαιοσύνην*, Ps. xl. 9 (LXX.: בִּשַּׂרְתִּי).

"Thy righteousness aloud,
Good tidings of great joy I tell."—(Keble.)

**8.** *For now we live, if ye stand fast in the Lord.*] For now we live indeed, "nunc sentimus nos vivere," expressive of the highest pleasure. "We live," it is matter of infinite joy to us" (Hammond); cf. St. John xiv. 19, and "your heart shall live for *ever*," Ps. xxii. 26; Ps. cxix. 77, and St. Augustine, 'Enarrat.' *Contrast* "I *die* daily," 1 Cor. xv. 31. "O what a tender heart he had, who yearned over his children with such affection that he could say, 'We live, if ye stand fast in the Lord'" (St. Anselm).

**10.** *Night and day.*] This is not mere hyperbole (cf. 2 Tim. i. 3). In the Psalms, "night is a great chapter, to which David often recurs" (Joseph de Maistre); see Ps. iv. 4, xvii. 3, xlii. 3, 8, lxxvii. 2, 6, cxix. 52.

*and might perfect that which is lacking in your faith?*] Supply the deficiencies (or "lacking measures," Bp. Ellicott) of your faith; cf. on Coloss. i. 24. This is quite consistent with the account in the Acts of St. Paul's comparatively brief stay at Thessalonica, which would have prevented the full instruction of the young church (Acts xvii. 1–10).

**11.** *God Himself.*] **He**, our **God**, and **Father** (*αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν*). It is beautiful to note through these Epistles in how many chapters the strain of exhortation is gently stirred by the sigh of prayer (cf. 1 Thess. iii. 11, v. 23; 2 Thess. i. 11, ii. 16, iii. 5–16).

*and our Lord Jesus Christ.*] It is important to notice, in this earliest of the Apostolic Epistles, that prayer and aspiration are naturally and spontaneously directed *to* Jesus by St. Paul. There is no foundation for any such statement as that "truly primitive and Apostolic prayer is invariably *to* God *through* Christ." The "may He direct" belongs to "our Lord Jesus Christ," as well as to "our God and Father."

*direct our way.*] *κατευθύναι*, optative,—"make straight" (Hammond). The *singular* verb here is certainly remarkable, preceded by two subjects—"God Himself," and "our Lord Jesus Christ." Precisely the same feature recurs in "He our Lord Jesus Christ and God our Father comfort your hearts" 2 Thess. ii. 17. The Epistle which stands first in order of time, is a manual of prayer to Christ—see also 2 Thessal. iii. 16. The prayer was abundantly granted (Acts xx. 1, 3; 1 Tim. i. 3). On the dogmatic bearing of this, see *Introduction*. In the word "direct" there is an underlying notion of taking obstacles out of the way—by sea (Grimm, s. v.)

A *favourable speed*
Ruffle thy mirror'd mast, and lead
*Through prosperous* floods."
(Tennyson.)

—by land, "fair adventure" befalling them.

**13.** *But* **you** *may the Lord make to increase and abound.*] The word 'you' stands emphatically at the beginning of this sentence; more emphatically, when we remember the immediately previous words (*κατευθ. τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ Κ. πλεον. καὶ περισσ.*) I pray that He may smooth the way which *we* desire to take to *you*. But *you*—whatever

Digitized by Google

comes of *us*, whether our way be made straight to you, or not—may He make you increase and abound!

*increase and abound.*] "Nearly synonymous. The former signifies spiritual *enlargement*, the second spiritual *abundance*, and has more of a superlative meaning" (Bp. Ellicott, p. 47).

**13.** *before God, even our Father.*] Before Him who is our God and Father.

*with all His saints*] More literally, "the saints of Him" (τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ). They are looked upon as emphatically *His* (cf. the words of Ananias, τοῖς ἁγίοις σου, Acts ix. 13). On this verse à Lap. well says, "The Apostle, full of the Spirit, here piles together much which was suggested by his affection, and is not *solicitous about words*, but leaves some to be understood or passes over them in silence."

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on *vv.* 2, 3.

**2, 3.** παρακαλέσαι . . . τὸ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι, where παρακ. governs τὸ with the infin. as an *accusative objective*. Παρακαλεῖν, in the sense of admonish, exhort, recommend, has a double accus. of person and thing in N. T. (cf. St. Luke iii. 18; St. Mark v. 23, 17; Acts viii. 31; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Titus ii. 13). The infin. with art., is often equivalent to a *substantive*, even when other words are added (so Schott, Winer, Reiche). The reading τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι of the Text. Recept. seems indefensible in every way. Lachm. ingeniously conjectures μηδὲν ἀσαίνεσθαι, thus keeping exactly all the letters. The meaning of ἀσαίνεσθαι is given by the lexicographers as ἄχθεσθαι, χαλεπῶς φέρειν (connect. with ἀσάομαι, "to feel nauseated.")

---

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *He exhorteth them to go on forward in all manner of godliness,* 6 *to live holily and justly,* 9 *to love one another,* 11 *and quietly to follow their own business:* 13 *and last of all to sorrow moderately for the dead.* 15 *And unto this last exhortation is annexed a brief description of the resurrection, and second coming of Christ to judgment.*

FURTHERMORE then we ¹beseech you, brethren, and ²exhort *you* by the Lord Jesus, that as ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, *so* ye would abound more and more.

¹ Or, *request.*
² Or, *beseech.*

2 For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus.

3 For this is the will of God, *even* your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication:

---

CHAP. IV.—**1.** *we beseech you.*] (ἐρωτῶμεν in classical Greek signifies ask questions. The best reading of this verse is:

"ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ, καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε, ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον" (Tischend. So Bp. Ellicott).

This seems to give the following meaning:

"We beseech you (even as ye have received from this letter, viz., how you are bound to keep walking and pleasing God), even as indeed ye do keep walking, that ye would abound more and more." With his gentle, inimitable tact, St. Paul assumes and implies that they were actually walking in the right way. "He does not simply exhort them to walk thus, but to abound more and more. When he presses *progress* upon them, he hints that they *are* on the road; for he only makes *progress* who has begun to walk. Summarily, this is to be their case: to make progress in the doctrine which they have received" (Calvin). The word περισσεύητε has a *comparative* significance.

**2.** *what commandments.*] The Apostle employs this word somewhat frequently to the Thessalonians (inf. v. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 4, 6, 10, 12). To Timothy he uses it himself (1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 13), and bids him freely use it to others (1 Tim. i. 3, iv. 11, v. 7, vi. 17). It would seem that when writing directly on affairs connected with the management of the Church he freely commands. His very tenderness is majestic.

It is strange to note M. Renan's perpetual vacillation and self-contradiction on this subject — constantly within a few pages — e.g. "Paul makes his authority felt with a *tone of superiority* which *shocks* us," p. 236; "He was the *first to repel* all which could have *looked like mastery*," *St. Paul*, p. 238. See notes on Philemon, v. 8 and v. 21.

*by the Lord Jesus.*] "He means this: the

Digitized by Google

4 That every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour;

5 Not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles which know not God:

6 That no *man* go beyond and [1]defraud his brother [1]in *any* matter:

[1] Or, *oppress*, or, *overreach*
[1] Or, *in the matter*.

---

things which I have commanded are not *mine*, but *His*."

3. *For this is the will of God.*] *Will* is used for the *faculty*—for the *act* of will—and for the *thing willed* ("*pro re volitâ*"). In Scripture "the will of God" is frequently used in the last sense. Thus here "the will of God, our sanctification," means that our sanctification is that which most pleases God. But this necessarily implies "will" in the first sense ("omne *velle* est a *voluntate*"). Pearson, Lect. XX. 'De voluntate Dei.' Minor Theol. Works, I. 206–207. Τὸ θέλημα came to be so indissolubly connected with the Divine will, or that which is willed by God, that it stands alone without the addition of God (Rom. ii. 18), occasionally even without the article (cf. οὐκ ἦν θέλημα, "it was not God's will that," 1 Cor. xvi. 12).

*sanctification.*] "frame of mind, holy disposition" (Waterland, vi. 7.)

*For this is the will of God, your sanctification, viz., that ye should abstain.*] He mentions sanctification generally, and then proceeds to indicate that which was the greatest enemy to sanctification, then and there—the *fornication* of heathen communities. [For the instinctive way in which even heathens associated *purity* and *sanctity*, cf.—

"Tuque, O *sanctissima* conjux!"
'Æneid,' XII. 258.]

St. Paul insists, with great solemnity, upon a truth which at various times, even in the Church, has been, if not denied, yet half forgotten, that *moral* evils are always *spiritual* evils of the first magnitude. It is certainly remarkable that here, and elsewhere repeatedly, the Apostle does not speak of this offence as of an evil scarcely known among, and little to be feared by, true believers, but rather as of an evil not only widely-spread but certain to assault them. Prof. Jowett finely says: "What he seems to penetrate is the inward nature of sin, not its outward effects. Even its consequences in another state of being are but slightly touched upon in comparison with that living death which itself is. It is not merely a vice or a crime, or even an offence against the law of God, to be punished here or hereafter. It is more than this. It is what men feel *within*; not what shall be, but what is; a terrible consciousness, a communion with unseen powers of evil" (Essay on 'Evils in the Church of the Apostolical Age,' Epistles of St. Paul, i. p. 77). For sins of the flesh, as eating into the very heart of Gentile social life, see Acts xv. 19, 20.

*fornication.*] More emphatic in original, "*the* fornication," sc. that which you see all around you.

4. *to possess his vessel.*] "to get **himself** (κτᾶσθαι) his own **vessel**" (Bp. Ellicott). It has been much debated whether the *vessel* here is (1) his own *wife*, or (2) his own *body*. In favour of (1) are, (a) the natural meaning of κτᾶσθαι; (b) the *opposition* of 'his own' to the *fornication* just spoken of; (c) the fraud and overreaching done to another ("his brother"). [This, however, would apply equally to wrong done by seduction or the like.]; (d) "vessel" seems to have become a common and understood Jewish equivalent for *wife* (see Schoettgen on v. 6). [The idea is in Proverbs v. 15. The word is not used, however, by LXX.] (e) the language of St. Peter ("unto the wife, as unto the *weaker vessel*," 1 St. Peter iii. 7. (2) *Body*, on the other hand, is the common interpretation, and that perhaps which suggests itself to most readers. It is a natural metaphor. Cicero speaks of the *body* as "*vas* et receptaculum animi." St. Barnabas calls the Body of Jesus "the vessel of the Spirit." Others refer to 2 Cor. iv. 7. Bengel and Estius point to 1 Sam. xxi. 5. כְּלֵי־הַנְּעָרִים ("the vessels of the young men"). It may be doubted, however, whether כְּלִי has the supposed meaning. There is perhaps some such metaphor in כִּלְיָה), see Gesen. 'Lex.' 400.] The great objections to the view which interprets "vessel" as "wife" are—(a) that the Apostle might seem to enjoin marriage upon all; (b) that the further words, "in sanctification," &c., "not in the lust," &c., would seem unsuitable [yet the fearful abuses of heathendom rather weaken this objection].

5. *which know not God.*] Subjective negative μή, "of whom we conceive as not knowing God." Ignorance of God is the fountain of impurity, cf. Rom. i. 24. "Look at the purity of the sky, and let a loathing for impurity take hold upon thee," cries Bengel.

6. Another aspect of impurity is here given – the wrong done to one's brother. The force is well expressed: "that no man should craftily compass and circumvent his brother to obtain his fleshly lusts." ('Necess.

Digitized by Google

because that the Lord *is* the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you and testified.

7 For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness.

8 He therefore that [1]despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his holy Spirit.

[1] Or, rejecteth.

9 But as touching brotherly love

---

Doct. and Erudition for any Christian Man,' quoted by Hammond.)

*defraud.*] (πλεονεκτεῖν.) The word in classical Greek is simply "to obtain more," and hence "to excel." In the LXX the ethical idea is added of "obtaining more *than is just*" (Ezekiel xxii. 27; Habakkuk ii. 9). This is invariable in the N. T. St. Jerome has pointed out strikingly the sort of *avarice* that there is in adultery. The A.V. is here unfortunate. Many readers substitute an illogical warning against dishonesty in general for a specific and powerful exhortation against sins of impurity. A less important inaccuracy in the translation of the words ἐν τῷ πράγματι, will be found in 2 Corinth. vii. 11.

*in any matter.*] Certainly not to be translated as in A. V.; but "in **the matter**," i.e. of which I am speaking; "getting out of him more than we should ever get."

*the Lord is the avenger* **concerning all such.**] The Lord—*Christ*—is specifically referred to as the Judge.

*as we* **moreover** *forewarned you, yea, and* **solemnly affirmed.**] The last word seems to have the implied sense of "witness, with interposed invocation of God and man," which is frequently expressed. (1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1; see Grimm, 'Clav. N. T.' s. v.) The peculiar solemnity of the Apostle's language, and the implied adjuration arise, no doubt, from the *riant* view of moral impurity taken in a Gentile community.

7. *unto uncleanness, but unto holiness.*] Rather, "God did not call us (1) **for** uncleanness, but (sub.—so that we should be) **in** holiness." (1) *For*, ἐπί means "*to, unto,*" of aim or end in view (as in Gal. v. 13. (2) "*In holiness*" the ἐν of medium, *contexture*, and surrounding conditions of life (Winer, 'Gr. Gr.' pt. iii. § xlviii. p. 412; cf. p. 436).

8. *therefore.*] **wherefore then** (Bp. Ellicott) should stand at the beginning of the sentence. The inference is logical. *If* God has so called us, *then* to reject is to reject *God*.

*he that despiseth.*] What, or whom? Four answers have been given. (1) *All* that has been mentioned from ver. 1, "*all* which I have here taught" (sc. his exhortation to their continued abundance in good, ver. 1; his commands, given by the influence of Jesus Himself, ver. 2; God's will, their sanctification, in abstaining from fornication, ver. 3; the wedded relation, with the judgment of Christ, ver. 6; God's call, ver. 7). (2) "A man" understood — "he who despiseth me, a man thus teaching, really despises, not a man, but God." (3) St. Paul's "commands," ver. 3. (4) The "calling," with its purpose mentioned just above, ver. 8. The choice would seem to lie between (1) and (4). The last is probably the most obvious and the most logical, while (1) would seem best to answer to the solemn and sustained elevation of the whole passage ("Qui hæc spernit," Vulg.). See Note at end of chapter.

*not man.*] No doubt, with an undertone of implied reference to himself individually, but used generally.

**that** *God, who hath also given unto us His Holy Spirit.*] It has been much discussed whether the participle here should be in the present or past (διδόντα, or δόντα). It has been conjectured that the former reading may have had its origin in a *dogmatic* scruple about the latter. The past might seem to restrict the effusion of the Holy Spirit to the moment when it was poured upon the Apostles, or when the Thessalonians received it at their Baptism. But the truth of the continual work, the evergiving of the Blessed Spirit, is not touched in the slightest degree by the past participle, "*who hath given,*" which is the true reading. The Apostle was only thinking of, and only appealed to, the first great act of God in the spiritual order, in the past gift of the Holy Ghost to those who believed and were baptized. The continuous bestowal of the Spirit in the souls of the faithful is not denied, but rather assumed. See the Introduction for the bearing of this text upon Baptism.

*who hath also.*] In addition to His calling us in holiness.

*his holy Spirit.*] The intensely and unmistakably *Personal* use of "His Holy Spirit" here (τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον) is a further confirmation of the reading "who *gave*." The Apostle thinks and speaks, not so much of the *continual giving* of the *gifts* of the Holy Ghost, as of that *Gift* which is the Holy Ghost Himself. The gift of Him who is not only the Sanctifier of men, but the very Living Sanctity of God, enhances the guilt of those who repudiate the Apostle's teaching upon purity. One passage not often, perhaps,

Digitized by Google

ye need not that I write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another.

10 And indeed ye do it toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia: but we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more;

11 And that ye study to be quiet,

---

cited on the question, will show the different way in which N.T. writers express themselves, when they intend to speak less definitely of the Holy Spirit, and with a shade of meaning purposely left indeterminate, between the Spirit Himself and His influences. In speaking of Simeon, St. Luke says Πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν (ii. 25)—almost as if he meant to express "there was a spiritual influence breathed on him, and that influence holy." St. Paul's words here, on the contrary, are almost equivalent to "Who hath given His Spirit—that Holy Spirit!—unto you."

*unto you.*] (εἰς ὑμᾶς). The preposition here does not merely signify "local motion," but is used, as sometimes elsewhere, with verbs of giving "for the good," or "advantage of" (see especially Ephes. iii. 2; Coloss. i. 25).

*unto us.*] A. V. The true and forcible reading is rather **you**. This has much more point in a hortatory passage of practical appeal. It has been suggested that the *us* may have been brought in by scribes, deceived by the apparent parallel of St. Luke x. 16 ("importunè memores," Reiche). The latter part of the verse might be rendered better, "**That God who hath also given His Holy Ghost unto you.**"

9. *no need of* **writing unto you**: *for ye* **yourselves** *are* **God-taught.**] Taught of God **unto** (εἰς) loving one another; εἰς expressing the aim and result of the teaching ("either notation of *end*, or simply of *effect*."—Hammond). The Apostle refers primarily to a passage in Isaiah, as if he said, "You are of those of whom the prophet of old said, 'All thy children are taught of God'" (Isaiah liv. 13, LXX.). Compare S. John vi. 45. The term (θεοδίδακτοι), like our Lord's words (διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ), refers not only to a partial and fragmentary lesson, but to a permanent relation established between the human mind and the Divine Teacher. We are pupils all our life through in the school of God. ["All thy children shall be לִמּוּדֵי יְהוָה—διδακτοὺς Θεοῦ LXX. Isaiah liv. 13. Cf. בְּלִמֻּדָי "among my learners" or "disciples." Isaiah viii. 16. Ps. xciv. 12.] The passage 1 Cor. ii. 13, is not a parallel, inasmuch as it speaks of a *special* Apostle gift. There can be little doubt that St. Paul is here referring to those words of our Lord, recorded a good many years afterwards by St. John (xiii. 35), and that, blending Isaiah liv. 13 with them, he speaks of Jesus, who taught them to his disciples, as *God*. The "of yourselves" (αὐτοὶ γάρ—see 1 Thess. i. 9, note)—and "God-taught" ("docibiles Dei," Vulg., St. John vi. 45), may well point to "the Thessalonians as a people docile, and apt to take the impression or most lively character of Christianity." Jackson, 'Works,' x. 239. Cf. also for God's *teaching*, Ps. xciv. 12; Jerem. xxxi. 33, 34; Hebrews viii. 11; 1 St. John ii. 21, 26, 27. Brotherly love is a part of your regenerate nature, one of those spiritual instincts which do not need writing about, for ye are yourselves God-taught into it. We may here, as often in St. John's Epistles, find a subtle thread of connection, "a root below the stream," fastened to what immediately precedes. He was speaking of adultery, of impurity, of that which the world esteems *love*, but which is so cruel and so false. This leads him to speak of true fraternal affection. (Cf. the Epistle to the Romans, where St. Paul puts "Thou shalt not commit adultery" at the head of the commandments which are fulfilled by the general command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Rom. xiii. 10.) Not extreme *love*, but extreme *selfishness*, is at the root of impurity. From the false love the Apostle here proceeds to the true.

10. *And indeed ye do it.*] Are **ever doing it**, i.e. loving one another.

*that ye increase more and more.*] cf. above iv. 1.

11. *And that ye study to be quiet.*] "**Be ambitious** (*contend*, Hammond) to **keep quiet**" (φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν). "There is a true and false ambition; political ambition *excludes* keeping quiet.... The expression containeth a remarkable emphasis, or a grave acumen, for whereas *ambition* commonly doth prompt men to be restlessly busy in the concernments proper to others, he biddeth them to be ambitious the contrary way, in affecting quiet, and abstinence from other affairs beside their own." (Barrow, Sermon XXI.) The word is used three times by St. Paul, always, it is remarkable, in a good sense—in this verse; of "ambition" to preach the Gospel (Rom. xv. 20); of "ambition" to please God (2 Cor. v. 9). The way in which St. Paul here shows us a natural impulse turned into its right direction affords a fine illustration of Bp. Butler's doctrine that "re-



Digitized by Google

and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you;

12 That ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and *that* ye may have lack [1]of nothing.

13 But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning

[1] Or, *of no man.*

ligion does not demand new affections, but only claims the direction of those we already have. Let the *man of ambition* go on still," &c. (Sermon XIII.) This doctrine is expanded by St. Augustine in a chapter which is perhaps the noblest in his greatest work. . . . "The citizens of the Holy City who live after God fear, and are ambitious, grieve and rejoice; and because their love is right, they have all their affections right also" ('De Civ. D.' xiv. 9). "If thou wilt seek glory, seek a glory, but one which is immortal." (S. Joann. Chrysost. 'in Joann. Homil.' xlii. 4, xxix. *ad fin.*)

*keep quiet.*] "Not *physical* but *moral* rest—a calm, steady, regular way of proceeding; such a motion as the heavenly bodies do keep, which so move that they seem ever to stand still, and never disturb one another." (Barrow.)

*to do your own business.*] to be, as the French might say, "affairés;" but with *one's own affairs*—"to act things proper and pertinent to us."

*to work with your own hands.*] The "*your own*" (ἰδίαις) of the Text. Rec. is omitted by many—Tischend., Bp. Ellicott, Lachm., Jowett—but it has much *external* authority (A, D, ℵ). And it has real *rhetorical* force, the *paronomasia* with the immediately preceding "*your own*" (πράσσ. τὰ ἴδια), being thoroughly *Pauline*. (Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 12: the reading in Ephes. iv. 28 is doubtful). There is a special propriety in this admonition, because it is addressed to men who had, as it were, tasted of the world to come, and seen the horizon of earth melting into the clouds of the Advent. An industrious community, like the Thessalonians, would scarcely have needed so urgent an appeal under ordinary circumstances. The Vulg. renders well—"Et *vestrum* negotium agatis, et operemini manibus *vestris*."—"Sua suis manibus quisque operetur."—Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.' in l.

12. The result of this life of studied quietness, manly restriction to their own business, and personal work with their own hands, would be twofold. (1) A life-walk which would be really dignified and becoming ("**becomingly**," εὐσχημόνως, Bp. Ellicott) towards those who were yet outside the communion of the Church. (2) The proper independence which would exempt them from a degrading need of any *man's* alms. (μηδενὸς χρείαν ἔχητε). [On the consistency of the verse with Our Lord's teaching, see Chrysost. on St. John vi. 27, Homil. XLIV.] St. Paul is addressing a population largely composed of laborious workmen and mechanics. He enters into their spirit completely. In this passage a series of ideas, which were foreign to the thought of the old Greek world, but which are the very life of modern progress, find their sanction in the New Test. (See Introduction to this Epistle.) Careful application to trade; judicious economy; honour and self-respect, founded upon the labour which makes the hands hard and horny; manly independence; are recognised in these two verses. There is an appeal to the sense of industrial honour in the lofty word "**becomingly**," and in the half-proud freedom of "**having need of no man**" (rather than *nothing*, A. V.). It was so understood by St. Jerome. "They are sharply censured because they go round idly from house to house, expecting food from others, while they try to make themselves agreeable to *this person and that* (*singulis*), and lounge about reporting what is going on here and there" ('Comm. in Galat.' Lib. II. Cap. II.).

13. We *would not have you to be ignorant.*] A *formula* somewhat frequently used by St. Paul to call attention to a new subject just introduced. (Rom. i. 13, xi. 25; 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8). The link of transition here, the "root below the stream," is very tender and beautiful. The paragraph just concluded (vv. 9, 12) treats of that brotherly love which was a part of the new spiritual life in Christ. The dead are not forgotten by Christian hearts. Christian "brotherly love" includes love for, and thought of, those who sleep in Jesus. This is indicated by the very order and sequence of this Epistle.

*concerning them which are asleep.*] "Them that are *sleeping*." Bp. Ellicott, who reads κοιμωμένων after A, B, ℵ, with Lachm., Jowett, &c.). It is probably better to translate "them that **are fallen (or have fallen) asleep**," and to read the perfect participle (κεκοιμημένων) with the Text. Rec. (1) The verb, frequently used of the sleep of the faithful departed—some *fourteen* times in the New Test. (see Bruder's 'Concord.' p. 500)—is once only used in the present, and then *historically* (1 Cor. xi. 30). "The sacred writers, comparing by a beautiful euphemism the dead with those that sleep, *constantly* use the præt., the aor., or the pft., excepting one rather obscure pas-

Digitized by Google

them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope.

14 For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus wi.. God bring with him.

15 For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive *and* remain unto the coming

---

sage (1 Cor. xi. 30). The same way of speaking is also usual with the LXX. (Isaiah xliii. 17, κ.τ.λ.)." (Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.' ii. 340, 341.) (2) But the perfect here also seems to meet the exact point which St. Paul had in view. His object now is to speak of those who were already dead whilst he had been writing: who were in the condition of death at that time, because they had already passed through the act of dying. It was concerning such especially that, so far as we can judge, the Thessalonians had directly asked a question: though, of course, all that St. Paul says of those *already dead* would be understood to apply to all who shall die, even until the second advent of the soul. But to have asserted this to the present or future would scarcely have the same delicacy or power. The question was—"Those, our dear ones, who *have* fallen asleep, who *are dead*, what of them?" The natural answer in replying would not run, —"as to those who *are sleeping*,"—so properly, as thus—"as to those who *have fallen asleep*, of whom you ask." For reasons which may have led scribes to make the charge, see Reiche in loc. One of these is striking. "To some scribes the pres. would probably appear more in accordance with tender Christian feeling. But those who have left this mortal life do not cease to exist, but are only resting in a sweet sleep, with a certain hope of living again."

*even as others.*] **The others, the rest,** sc. the heathen (so Ephes. ii. 3).

*which have* **not** *hope.*] The subjective negative μή, "of whom, as a class, we conceive that they have not hope." (See the desolating passages, Plat. 'Phæd.' 64; Theocrit. Idyll iv. 42; Catullus, v. 4; Lucret. iii. 942.)

**14.** For if we believe—as we assuredly do (εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν)—that Jesus once for all died and rose, even so also (sub. καὶ πιστεύειν δεῖ, or the like), *we* are *bound to believe that* them who have *been laid to sleep through Jesus*, God will lead with Him.

*them* **who have been laid to sleep through Jesus.**] Not assuredly "those that sleep *through Jesus*, by occasion of Him, for Christianity's sake, martyrs" (Hammond and others); nor "in Jesus;" but the *mediatorial* διὰ, those who through Him are "rightly accounted as 'sleeping'" (Bp. Ellicott). See his excellent note, and the reasons given in it for connecting "*through Jesus*" with "those who have been laid to sleep," rather than with the following verb, "will bring through Jesus."

*God will* **lead** *with Him.*] ἄξει. Beng., beautifully: "A tender word, used of the living." (It denotes "bringing with one as a companion," 2 Tim. iv. 11). Cf., for the thought, the close of the 48th Psalm, "He will *lead us* [not *unto*, but *unto and*] *over Death*" (Ps. xlviii. 14). We should not fail to notice, with Beng., how, by a beautiful interchange, *death* is here, as often, predicated of *Jesus; sleep*, of *believers* (1 Cor. xv. 3, 6–18, 20–51).

**15.** *For this we say unto you* **in** *the wora of the Lord.*] (ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου). The *formula* for a new revelation. The LXX so translates בִּדְבַר יְהוָה (1 Kings xv. 35). No doubt it is an assertion of express inspiration in this case, and may be fairly paraphrased, as M. Renan has done, "What I speak to you is as if the Lord said it to you.' ('Saint Paul,' p. 250.)

*we which are alive and remain.*] *We.*—It is important here to observe that the Apostle's language should not be pedantically restricted, as if "*we*" were necessarily to be taken literally. It is the broad, emotional, imaginative, not the restricted and historical *we*—the *we*, not of him who associates himself with some accidental and arbitrary class, but of him who believes in the "Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints"—the *we* of a true member of the supernatural community. He writes as a living man to living men, from the point of view of intimate communion with them; with that prophetic sympathy with the Church of the future which makes his pulses throb in unison with the whole waiting Congregation of the redeemed. He puts himself in the same attitude with those who shall be alive at the Great Advent. "All that are alive on earth, as we now are." (Hammond.) Speaking as the mouthpiece of a generation which, like each of its successors, represents those who shall finally be alive at the Lord's coming; he says *we—we*, the *living*, the *left over* (οἱ περιλειπόμενοι). Words compounded with περί have the sense of "over and above," because that which goes *round* anything does not belong to it, but lies *outside* it) see Grimm. 'Lex. N. T.' p. 344); "les réservés" (Renan). The word may not be without that tinge of sadness



Digitized by Google

of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.

16 For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:

17 Then we which are alive *and* remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

18 Wherefore [1]comfort one another with these words.

[1] Or, *exhort.*

---

which pervades another compound of λείπω. (For καταλείπειν in the pathetic sense of "leaving behind, alone in the world," see *supra* on iii. 1). This would be in subtle harmony with the object which St. Paul had in view. The fear which the Thessalonians had for their beloved ones was, lest they might have suffered some loss. They pitied them because they were taken. By this twice-repeated word, the pathetic refrain of this wonderful dirge (vv. 15, 17) St. Paul seems to say—Not they are to be pitied. Rather we who are left over, left without them in the world. If there is any leaving *out* in the case, it is we who are left *out*, not they. As to the present particip.—the Lord's Advent ever brings a present tense to the Apostle's lips. (See St. Peter's language, Acts x. 42.) "He *is* (αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὡρισμένος . . . κριτής) the God-ordained judge."

*shall in* **no wise** *go* **before** *those that* **have been laid to sleep.**] In **no wise** (the double negative); go **before** (φθάσωμεν). On the aor. conj. for future in time uncertain and indefinite, see Winer, 'Gr. Gr.' § lx. Hammond's rendering, "shall have no *advantage of*," seems too decidedly pronounced, though such a shade of thought probably underlies the word. "We shall not only not reign in glory without them who are laid to sleep, but we shall not even go *before* them to meet Christ." (Est.) We shall not *anticipate* those who have fallen asleep; *i.e.* shall not arrive more quickly to communion with Christ, nor have an earlier enjoyment of beatitude; we shall not have the advantage of them by one golden hour of Christ's Presence.

**16.** *the Lord himself.*] He, **the Lord.** There is great dignity in the words (αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος). Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 16.

*shall descend from heaven.*] Better to retain the order in the original: "**With a shout,** with **Archangel's voice,** and with **trump of God,** shall descend from heaven."

*with.*] ἐν, of accompaniment, concomitance.

*a shout.*] With a cry of command ringing forth, like that of the general of a great army.

*with archangel's voice.*] We can only profitably refer to St. Jude, v. 9. For different orders of angels, see Coloss. i. 16.

*with the trump of God.*] Not Hebraistic, "*God's* trumpet, therefore great;" (Bengel), but the trumpet pertaining to God, and used in God's service. (Cf. "harps of *God,*" Apoc. xv. 2.) We may think of Exod. xix. 6; Ps. xlvii. 5 ("the great trumpet"); Isai. xxvii. 13; Zechar. ix. 14. There is no reference to the *Jewish* festival use of trumpets (Numb. x. 2; xxxi. 6; Josh. ii. 1). We can only point to St. Paul's assertion, with its most emphatic repetition—"at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound (1 Cor. xv. 52). St. Matt. xxiv. 31, is perhaps not exactly parallel. (See Bishop Ellicott's compressed and reverential note, p. 66.)

> "Tuba mirum spargens sonum
> Per sepulchra regionum
> Coget omnes ante Thronum."

(See note at the end of the chapter.)

*the dead in Christ shall rise first.*] St. Paul only deals here with the resurrection of the *just*, as in 1 Cor. xv.—first, "the first act of the last great drama."

**17.** *we which are alive.*] Winer lays it down that the qualification annexed to the "dead" in the last clause—"*in Christ*"—is carried on by the contrast to this; so that "we which are living" (sub. "*in Christ*") answers to "the dead *in Christ*" (v. 16). (Winer, 'Gr. Gr.' p. iii. ss. xx. p. 147.) On the words, "which are alive and remain," see note *supra*, v. 15.

*shall be caught up* **in clouds.**] "By some inner power, innate in the regenerate"—(Estius).

*caught away* (same words in Acts viii. 3–9. "The Spirit of the Lord *caught* away Philip"—"The Apostle seems to declare that some at the Lord's Advent will not die; but, being found alive, will suddenly be changed into the immortality which is given to the other saints, and *caught away in clouds* with them. Often as I have thought over these words, I could never form any other opinion of their meaning." St. August. 'Ad tertiam quæst. Dulcitii.' This may bear upon the translations of Enoch and Elijah. (St. Hieron. Epist. 61; Pearson on 'Creed,' Art. xi. p. 588.)

*to meet the Lord in the air.*] The Apostle does not speak of either earth or heaven as the first meeting-place of the living and dead

Digitized by Google

with their Lord, but of the *air*. The air is not to be their abiding-place. Rather St. Paul elsewhere appears to sanction the Jewish idea of the air being an ample space tenanted by evil spirits. (See Meyer on Ephes. ii. 2.) There seems to be nothing in the pregnant brevity of this awful passage against our understanding that the godly, absolved, are rapt away above as assessors of the Judgment (Psalm cxlix. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 3, 6)—they in many clouds, He pre-eminent in one. Cf the *plural* "clouds," St. Matt. xxiv. 30; xxvi. 64; St. Mark xiii. 26; xiv. 62; 1 Thess. iv. 17; with the *singular*, St. Luke xxi. 27. See also Acts i. 9, "a *cloud* received Him," and "shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen Him go into Heaven."—*Ibid*. v. 11.

**18.** *Wherefore comfort one another with these words.*] A little more than 300 years after the Epistle arrived at its destination, seven thousand people were put to death in the circus at Thessalonica, within three hours, by order of the Emperor Theodosius (A.D. 389). Of this hideous massacre one most touching anecdote is told (St. Ambros. Ep. 51). Is it fanciful to suppose that these words, addressed to those who had lived in the same spot by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, may have had peculiar power to comfort the bereaved people of Thessalonica? For these facts, and for the magnificent episode of the exclusion of Theodosius from the Church at Milan by St. Ambrose, see Sozomen. vii. 25, and the beautiful allusion in Chrysost. 'In Matt. Homil.' 8, 2, 6. One other historical association, in this instance a contrast, may be noted. Cicero wrote one letter—tender and pathetic, in spite of the almost hysterical vehemence of passionate grief by which it is disfigured—to those who were dearest to him. Of his hopes of re-union on earth he can only say, with fatalistic resignation, "*Hæc non sunt in manu nostrâ*." The last word of that letter of despair is the name of the city from which it was dated—*Thessalonicæ*. (C. Tullius, Terentiæ, Tulliolæ, et Ciceroni suis." Cic. 'Epist. ad Fam.' xiv. 2).

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 8, 16.

**8.** ἀθετῶ—lit. to render anything ἄθετον—the negative of that which is fixed and ordered (θετόν). As applied to a *thing*, it is best rendered by some word expressing *frustration* or *repudiation* (cf. St. Luke vii. 30; Galat. ii. 21); as applied to a *person*, it expresses *despisal*, *contempt* (see Grimm. 'Clav. N. T.' p. 9).

**16.** Of all the solemn associations connected this the verse, few can surpass the following, recorded in many of the foreign papers of the day. At the earthquake of Manilla (1863), the cathedral fell upon the clergy and congregation. The mass of ruin overhead and around the doomed assemblage was kept for a time from crushing down upon them by some peculiarity of construction. Those outside were able to hear what was going on in the church, without the slightest possibility of clearing away the ruins, or of aiding those within, upon whom the building must evidently fall before long. A low deep bass voice, doubtless that of the priest officiating, was heard uttering the words, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord." As this sentence came forth, the multitude burst into a passion of tears, which was soon choked. For some deep groans issued from within, apparently wrung from the speaker by intense pain, and then the same voice spoke in a calm and even tone, as if addressing a congregation, and all heard the words, "The Lord Himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."

## CHAPTER V.

1 *He proceedeth in the former description of Christ's coming to judgment,* 16 *and giveth divers precepts,* 23 *and so concludeth the epistle.*

BUT of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you.

2 For yourselves know perfectly

CHAP. V.—**1.** *But* **concerning** *the times and the seasons.*] 1. (τῶν χρόνων), time *chronologically*; 2. (τῶν καιρῶν), time in relation to eras or crises—(cf. Dan. ii. 21; Wisdom viii. 8; Acts i. 7).

**1, 2.** *ye have no need to* **be written** *to. For yourselves know perfectly.*] On αὐτοὶ γάρ cf. sup. on i. 9. It is important to see *why* the Apostle uses the special image of the *thief* in reference to the Second Advent, and assumes an *accurate* knowledge of the matter on their part. Even at this early period, at the time when the first Epistle of St. Paul was written, it was

Digitized by Google

that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night.

3 For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape.

4 But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.

5 Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness.

6 Therefore let us not sleep, as *do* others; but let us watch and be sober.

7 For they that sleep sleep in the night; and they that be drunken are drunken in the night.

8 But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation.

9 For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ,

10 Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.

---

grooved into Christian consciousness from the word of Jesus—"The *Thief cometh*" (St. Matt. xxiv. 43). The popular parabolic form gave currency to the word and to the idea (cf. Joel ii. 9).

**by** *night.*] For the connection of the Great Advent with *night*, see again *our Lord's* teaching (St. Matt. xxv. 6; St. Luke xvii. 34).

**3.** *when they shall say, Peace and safety.*] Apparently a reference to Ezekiel xiii. 10, LXX. as travail, rather "**the birth-throe**" (ἡ ὠδὶν). On the *suddenness* of the *parousia* as illustrated by the *suddenness* of the pangs of labour, see some striking sentences of Chrysost. ('Homil. in Joann.' xxxv. 3).

**4.** *that the* **day.**] "That" is ecbatic, not telic. It does not express *purpose*, but simply consequence—"for the day to surprise you."

*as a thief.*] For reasons for preferring this reading to the plural, "should overtake you *as thieves*," see *sup.* on i. 8 (note 2.)

**5.** *Ye are all* **sons** *of light.*] Cf. Ephes. v. 8. "Our very Baptism entitleth us thereunto, which is the sacrament of our initiation, whereby we are made children of God. Whence, in the Greek fathers Baptism is usually called an *enlightening*, and persons newly baptized *newly-enlightened*, and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν φωτῶν an officer in the Greek Church, with many other phrases and expressions borrowed from the same metaphor of *light*, and applied in like matter to Baptism." (Bp. Sanderson's Sermons, p. 570.)

**6.** *as . . . others.*] (as the **rest.**) See *sup.* on iv. 13.

**7.** *For they that sleep sleep* **by night,** *and they that be drunken are drunken* **by night.**] It would seem that the literal meaning is here preferable. The sleep is a literal sleep, the drunkenness a literal drunkenness. These two things are samples of the whole line of feeling and conduct of thoroughly indolent and dissipated men, whose pleasure is in the darkness and covert of the night. (See Schott's note.) A distinction has been made between (1) "they that be drunken," and (2) "are drunken"—as if (1) denoted the *act* (2) the *state* or *habit* of drunkenness. But this distinction seems very doubtful in itself; and the absolute identity of "they that sleep, sleep," rather leads us to expect a like identity in a sentence so antithetically balanced.

**8. Having put on a** *breast-plate of faith and love.*] Faith, hope, and love appear in this verse. It is interesting to trace in the breastplate and helmet the germ of the image so magnificently expanded in Ephes. vi. 11, 17. See also Rom. xiii. 12, 2 Cor. x. 4. (Cf. Isai. lix. 17, of which there is certainly a reminiscence here.)

**9.** *For God did* **not appoint** *us to wrath.*] The "*for*" follows next after the word *salvation* at the close of the previous verse. "The hope of salvation—I say deliberately *salvation*—because God appointed us to acquisition (or possession) of *salvation*."

**9, 10. Through** *our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us.*] (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) on our behalf, and in our place. It is idle, with these words of St. Paul's earliest Epistle before us, to speak of his subsequent exaggerated developments of *soteriology*.

*that whether we* **watch** *or sleep.*] In *order that* (ἵνα), "the holy purpose of the Lord's redeeming death." (Bishop Ellicott.) This word "watch" was so popular a motto of early Christian life—caught, as it was, from the lips of Christ (St. Mark xiii. 34, 35, 37)—that it took the form of a name—Gregory. It has been said that there are three sleeps for man—those of nature, sin, and death; and three correspon-

Digitized by Google

¹ Or, *exhort.*

11 Wherefore ¹comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as also ye do.

12 And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you;

13 And to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. *And* be at peace among yourselves.

---

dent awakenings—those of nature, righteousness, and life eternal (Est.). It is of the second that St. Paul here speaks. "Salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us with this purpose, in order that whether we keep life's long toilful watch, or fall asleep in what is called death, we should have our true life, together with (ἅμα σὺν) Him."

*and edify the* **one the other.**] "Edifying" is one of the metaphorical words which have passed into the language of Christianity from the lips of our Lord Himself. The foundation and progress of the Christian life is likened by Him to the process of building a house (cf. "the wise man who *built* (ᾠκοδόμησεν) his house," &c. —St. Matt. vii. 24, *seq.*; cf. also ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον, St. Luke vi. 1, 8; τεθεμελίωτο, St. Matt. vii. 25, with τεθεμελιωμένοι, Coloss. i. 23; θεμελιώσει, 1 St. Pet. v. 10), and the parable of the improvident builder (St. Luke xiv. 28). Christ said of His Church, "I will *edify my Church*" (St. Matt. xiv. 18). Thus the Christian Church and the Christian soul are alike compared to a building or temple. That building will not be *finished out* (*exædificari*) until Christ comes. Those who by sympathy, word, or deed, assist the growth of Christian wisdom, feeling, or life, are conceived of as *builders*, helping others or themselves to supply some part for the construction of the spiritual edifice, and are said to *edify*. (Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1, xiv. 3, 4; Coloss. ii. 7, &c.)

*the* **one the other.**] (εἷς τὸν ἕνα). Used in a markedly reciprocal statement (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 6). It is said to be an Aramaism (see Winer, Part III. § 27, p. 186). "Each one of you each other whom he meets."

*even as also ye are* **doing.**] Cf. the words 'as ye do indeed keep walking,' *supra*, iv. 1.

It is like the old English naval direction to the man at the helm to continue steering exactly in the same point—adopted as a motto by a great Admiral. "*Thus*"—

**12.** Introduces a marked *ecclesiastical* element—"to know them which are presiding *over you* in the Lord." It may be going too far to say, with some, that as the important city of Thessalonica would have churches connected with, and in a sense under it, these Epistles were practically in some degree addressed to all the Macedonian churches, and that these προϊσταμ. (προεστῶτες, prefects, presidents) may refer to, or include, Bishops. But, at all events, at this early period, St. Paul distinctly recognises a *teaching ministry*, an order of men separated from the rest of the congregation. St. Paul's exhortation happily expresses the blended feelings of (1) respectful esteem, and (2) affectionate love. (See *infra* on Philemon, v. 8, and v. 21.) (1) "to esteem them very highly," literally the Vulgate's '*superabundanter*,' abundantly and something more. (2) "in love." "Reverencing them abundantly" (Hammond), holding them at the same time in love for their work's sake—a conduct and feeling compounded of duty and affection. It is characteristic that St. Paul does not touch the question of bad and unfaithful ministers. And this circumstance may have some weight in leading us to question the view which finds a severe censure in the message to Archippus. (Coloss. iv. 17. See Philemon Introd. and note on v. 2.) Writing later to a *ruler* of the Church, he does not shrink from doing so (1 Tim. iii. 3–6, 10, v. 1, 19, 20–22; κ.τ.λ.). [See further remarks in the Introduction to this Epistle.]

It may not be without interest to mention that one of the principal writers of the Greek Church upon the Ministry came from Thessalonica in the 8th century. [See the treatise of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, περὶ τῶν ἱερων χειροτονιῶν, in Morinus, 'De Sacris Ordinationibus,' pp. 127–191.] It should be observed that the position of the article (τοὺς κοπιῶντας καὶ προϊσταμένους καὶ νουθετοῦντας) shows that these three attributes belong to the Ministry as *one class*, and cannot be parcelled out between different forms or divisions of it.

**13.** *be at peace among yourselves.*] For the Text. Rec. (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς) some, not without a certain amount of external authority (א, D) read εἰρην. ἐν αὐτοῖς, "esteem and love those who are over you—at the least, and lowest however, *be at peace with them.*" But (1) there is a serious objection to a mode of expression which can only be justified as a *Hebraism*, but which is quite inconsistent with Hebrew usage. For הִשְׁלִים is joined with אֵת, and אִם, never with בְּ (ἐν), just as St. Paul says μετὰ πάντων εἰρηνεύοντες, Rom. xii. 18 (*Pelt.*). (2) The whole context supplies a stronger argument against this view. The Apostle is now passing on to duties, not of a *special*, but of a *general* kind ("toward *all men*"—"to *all men*," iv. 14, 15). He is easily led on here

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *beseech.*
[2] Or, *disorderly.*

14 Now we [1]exhort you, brethren, warn them that [2]are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all *men*.

15 See that none render evil for evil unto any *man*; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all *men*.

16 Rejoice evermore.

17 Pray without ceasing.

18 In every thing give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you.

---

from the special duty of respect and affection to spiritual pastors and masters to the general duty of mutual Christian peacefulness. It is a short step from contempt and dislike of pastors to all the bitter evils of party spirit.

*be at peace.*] Keep *peace*. The same exhortation is in many Epistles (Rom. xii. 18; 1 Cor. i. 10, *sqq.* &c.). The exhortation here is not carried out into detail; probably no special quarrels had yet arisen in the Thessalonian Church. It has not been sufficiently noted that here again (as *supra*, v. 2) we have a distinct reference to, and quotation of, one of the words of our Lord (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις, St. Mark ix. 50). It is something more than a reminiscence of that saying, and another of the many links which connect the language of St. Paul with the recorded teaching of our Lord.

**14.** (1) *comfort* (2) the *feeble-minded* (παραμυθεῖσθε τοὺς ὀλιγοψύχους). (1), "to offer *words* to any one, specially for the purpose of tranquillizing and soothing." "Have a *word* for," "speak them fair"—**console** or **encourage** (Bishop Ellicott). (2) The *feeble-minded.* "Littleness" is implied. (See Isaiah xxxv. 4. LXX.) The word occurs here only in the N. T., and is almost unknown in classical Greek. The student of Aristotle will instinctively look upon it as implying the contradictory of the μεγαλόψυχος, with his high estimate of himself, 'just contempt' of others, and freedom from excessive elation or depression ('Ethic. Nic.' iv. cap. iii.). The opposite of the 'high-souled man' is called by Aristotle the μικρόψυχος. (*Ibid.* 12.) The passage (iv. 13, *sqq.*) might well lead us to suppose that, as the Thessalonian Christians had a tender and almost feminine susceptibility about those whom they had loved and lost, so they would be likely also to have some of the rest of the characteristics which usually accompany that beautiful weakness. (We may perhaps refer to the "chief *women* not a few" among St. Paul's Thessalonian converts (Acts xvii. 4).) The morbid conscientiousness, the form of self-torment, known to spiritual writers as *scrupulousness*, would be well expressed by the word "little-minded." It has been said (and this verse given as one of the references), "The assembled Church, at least the spiritual, reprimanded those in fault, and consoled those who were cast down, and performed the part of a skilful director versed in the mysteries of the human heart" (Renan, 'St. Paul,' p. 240). Surely St. Paul's language here does not lead us to think of what was to be done by the Church *officially*, but of private intercourse, pastoral or general.

**15.** Professor Jowett observes on this verse, that "it is not strictly true to say that Christianity alone, or first, forbad to return evil for evil." (Gibbon quotes from Isocrates with the same purpose. But Isocrates, after all, only takes the *negative* side. "Do not to others what would enrage yourself.") But Professor Jowett clearly and eloquently makes two claims for the Gospel: (1) That it brought into the position of a practical principle the spirit of gentle good-will, until it embraced even enemies. (2) That it made a speculative philosophical refinement a rule of life for *all*.

**16.** *Rejoice evermore.*] Note (1) that Christianity unlocks the whole of man's nature, and makes a claim upon his *affections* and *emotions* as well as upon his *external conduct*. (2) Christian joy cannot merely be another word for high spirits. These we cannot command. A Christian is no Stoic, no hero cut out of marble. Nay, his Master's broken heart and bitter cry find a counterpart in him. Indeed, one peculiar source of sorrow belongs to a Christian as such—the painful sense of sin and disproportion between his standard and his attainments. A Christian is not a man who *has* no sin, but one in whom sin does not *rule*; and for this remaining sin he has special sorrow. Yet, by one of the antinomies which lie at the root of the Christian life, he has joy in sin forgiven, in the Spirit given, in the means of grace, in the hope of glory. Joy is the sun of the Epistle to the Philippians particularly; it sparkles like light on the crest of every wave of feeling in it (cf. Philipp. i. 18; ii. 2, 19, 28; iii. 1, iv. 1–4). See Barrow's noble Sermon on this text beginning with the exclamation, "O good Apostle, how acceptable rules dost thou prescribe!" (Sermon XLIII.)

**17.** *Pray without ceasing.*] The *ideal* of prayer is the silent reference of *all* our actions to God. In two of his most admirable Ser-

Digitized by Google

19 Quench not the Spirit.

20 Despise not prophesyings.

21 Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

22 Abstain from all appearance of evil.

23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and *I pray*

---

mons Barrow shows what ἀδιαλείπτως implies: (1) habitual inclination, a *spirit of supplication* (Zechariah xii. 10); (2) vigilant attendance upon prayer as a main purpose of life; (3) embracing all fit opportunities for prayer; (4) not desisting until our prayers are answered; (5) interlacing devout ejaculations with all our occupations and all occurrences; (6) appointing certain times, and carefully keeping them—like "the continual sacrifice" cf. Dan. viii. 11; Nehem. x. 53; with Heb. xiii. 15); (7) observation of times ordained by authority, or settled by custom ('Sermons on Several Occasions,' vi. vii.).

**18.** *for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus* **toward** *you.*] For *this—this*, referring to the three preceding exhortations. *This* is your high ideal; *this* God's will in Christ —even perpetual joy, unfailing prayer, unbroken and universal thanksgiving.

**19.** *Quench not the Spirit.*] A reference to the fire of Pentecost, and to that kindled in the Christian's spirit. "Not doing anything to damp the fire of the Holy Ghost" (Keble, 'Studia Sacra,' p. 233). Chrysostom interweaves this verse with a reference to the parable of the ten virgins (S. Matt. xx. 5-8): "That flame which we once receive by the grace of the Spirit, if we will, we shall make stronger, if we will we shall lose. It is extinguished when it has not oil; when it is blown upon by a rougher blast; when it is compressed together. When we pour on water in addition, how can the light be kindled again? Then shall we depart with the much smoke witnessing against us that we had lamps and extinguished them; for where there was smoke there must have been flame, now quenched." ('In Joann. Homil.' L.) "Wherever the Spirit *is*, He *burns*; therefore He is not to be *quenched* in ourselves or others." (Bengel.) "The Spirit does *excite*, he does not *compel*. He incites and moves, but by soft calls and gentle whispers, such as may be resisted, and often are resisted; otherwise, how come we to hear of "grieving the Holy Spirit of God" (Ephes. iv. 30), and of "quenching the Spirit?" (Waterland, 'Works,' v. 641).

**20, 21.** *Despise not prophesyings*, **but bring all things to the test.**] Among the noble gifts of the Spirit in 1 Cor. xii. 10, the *critical* hold their place. It has been said on the verse before us that the true meaning is not "make a rational enquiry into all things. The organ of discernment was of another and of a spiritual kind." (Prof. Jowett.) Surely we have no right to say so altogether. The spiritual teaching included the power of a sanctified *common sense*. The Apostle seems to say, "Despise not prophesyings, yet do not give way to a pious, but feeble enthusiasm. Make a religious, but grave and thorough examination, by such tests as you possess." (Cf. for similar advice, 1 Cor. xii. 10; xiv. 29; 1 John iv. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 1.). It has been conjectured that the pregnant particle—"but" —here so full of meaning, was omitted by many copyists because they thought it seemed strange and irreverent to subject prophecies to human criticism and examination.

*hold fast that which is good.*] "After due care in examining, naturally follow wisdom in choosing, and firmness in retaining." (Waterland. See his Sermons upon this text, 'Works,' v. 655–666.)

**22.** *Abstain from all appearance of evil.*] (ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ: εἶδος, **kind, sort**, rather than *appearance*—"from all *sort*, or the whole *kind* of evil." (Hammond.) It seems to run parallel with the Jewish rule. "Be as cautious in keeping a light, as a heavy commandment." "Abstain not from this or that sin, but absolutely and universally from all sin." (Theophyl.)

**23.** *But may* **He**, *the God of Peace, sanctify you wholly.*] Again, the magnificent αὐτός, cf. *supra*, iii. 11.

*and* **whole be** *your spirit and soul and body*, **kept without blame in** *the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*] *Spirit, soul, and body* It is easy to say that St. Paul is "not writing a treatise upon the soul, but pouring forth a prayer from the fulness of his heart;" that "language like this should not be closely analysed;" or even "that the age in which St. Paul lived would not admit of his writing with any great accuracy about the soul." Those who believe that Scripture contains a revelation think otherwise, and have always studied this verse with peculiar care. Christian writers naturally compare Gen. ii. 7. St. Paul severs the entire man into three parts, *spirit, soul, body*. So Moses seems to give (1) *dust*, corresponding to *body* (עָפָר), (2) נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, to *soul*, (3) נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים, to *spirit*. It is a grave objection, however, that this word is never that used for *spirit*, which would be רוּחַ. Of the *three* divisions of St. Paul, Bp. Bull and others have given this explanation. (1) *Body*, material organiza-

Digitized by Google

*God* your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

24 Faithful *is* he that calleth you, who also will do *it*.

25 Brethren, pray for us.

26 Greet all the brethren with an holy kiss.

27 I [1]charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.

[1] Or, *adjure*.

28 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you. Amen.

---

tion; (2) *Soul*, sensitive faculty (St. Luke xii. 20; St. Matt. x. 39, xvi. 25, 26; 1 Thess. ii. 8) would seem, certainly, to stand for the "animal, sentient life," conceived of as indissolubly connected with breath (Jeremiah xv. 9). (3) *Spirit* is the superior faculty, capable of Divine communications, which man lost at the Fall, but recovers again in his regeneration. The Apostle would thus speak of the sensitive mortal *soul;* of the immortal *spirit* of new life and higher reason; and of the *body*, the seat of both. No real light can be thrown upon the passage by turning to the trichotomy in classical writers (as in Mill, 'Analysis of Pearson,' p. 87), and supposing that St. Paul accepts the division of the soul into the vegetative, sensitive, and rational—the Spirit corresponding to the 'ruling' portion. The one key to St. Paul's meaning is the principle that besides body and soul—which make up man's natural being—regenerated man possesses *spirit*, the principle of supernatural life. This has been somewhat unfairly called Bull's theory, and accused of making up a tetractomy—body, soul, spirit, and Holy Spirit. The charge, indeed, may hold good against certain expressions of Bishop Bull ('Works,' i. 32). But we should remember that, according to apostolic usage, "the believer is separated by a thin film from the Spirit of God .... Language wavers in its meaning between the two, or seems to comprehend both." (Prof. Jowett, i. p. 151). Those who have followed the intellectual career of Maine de Biran will see that it was a long ascent from the conception of body and soul to that of body, soul, and spirit. His psychology began with Condillac; it ended with St. Paul. (See note at end of the chapter.)

*whole.*] (ὁλόκληρον.) Literally "*all* that falls by *lot;*" hence, "that which consists of all its parts." It is one of the translations of תְּמִימֹת in the LXX (Levit. xxiii. 15). ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδας ὁλοκλήρους, "seven sabbaths shall be *complete*." The Hebrew word seems to blend the notions of physical, moral, and numerical entireness. (Fuerst, 'Concord. Heb.' 1228).

*kept without blame.*] "The soul is the seat of affections; the Spirit is rectified reason. This reason is the sovereign; these affections are the officers; this body is the executioner. Reason authorizes; affections command; the body executes. And when we conceive in our minds, desire in our hearts, perform in our body, nothing that displeases God, then have we had benefit of St. Paul's prayer, that in body, and soul, and spirit, we may be blameless." (Donne's LXXX. Sermons, pp. 335–336.)

**24.** This little verse has been called the "sum of all delight." "If you enjoy His *calling*, rejoice in His *faithfulness*, who will do it."

*will do it.*] What? All that is implied in "being *preserved*." (v. 23). For "Faithful is He." Cf. 2 Cor. i. 9.

**26.** *Greet all the brethren with an holy kiss.*] Rom. xvi. 6, 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 St. Peter v. 14. For the connection of this with the Holy Communion, see Introduction to this Epistle. M. Renan quotes the following authorities: Just. 'Apolog.' i. 63; 'Constit. Ap.' ii. 52, viii. 11; Tertull. 'de Orat.' 14; cf. Gen. xxxiii. 4; 2 Sam. xiv. 23; St. Luke xv. 20, where the kiss signifies *reconciliation*. Cf. Suicer, 'Thesaur.' ἀσπάζομαι, φίλημα; Renaudot, 'Lit. Orient. Coll.' I. pp. 12, 26, 39, 40, 142. It may be usefully remembered that Hooker refers to this passage for the purpose of showing the lawfulness of discontinuing ancient customs, when utterly unsuitable to a changed order of society. "True it is the ancienter the better ceremonies of religion are; howbeit, not absolutely true and without exception; but only true so far forth as those different ages do agree in the state of those things, for which, at the first, those rites, orders, and ceremonies were instituted. In the Apostles' times that was harmless, which being now revived, would be scandalous; as their *oscula sancta*." (Hooker, 'E. P., Preface,' iv.)

**27.** *I charge you by the Lord.*] This is Divine worship of *Christ* on Scriptural principles (cf. "every one that *sweareth by Him*," i.e. *every worshipper* of *God*, Ps. lxiii. 11).

*that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.*] This is by implication a remarkable *ecclesiastical* sanction claimed for

Digitized by Google

this Epistle. In the Jewish Church, Moses and the Prophets were constantly read (St. Luke iv. 16; Acts xii. 27, xv. 21). The injunction here reminds us of the blessing in Apoc. i. 3, and it is remarkable that it is given with such impressive solemnity ("I charge you by the Lord Jesus Christ"). Surely it suggests the duty of reading passages of the New Test. in Church, and ever the guilt of neglecting it, or of keeping it from the people. (Bp. Wordsworth in loc.) This is one of the passages which give us an idea of the great authority attributed to Apostolic Epistles from the earliest times. They were carried by the Apostle's delegates (like the *iggereth* of the synagogues); they were held to have equal dogmatic authority with the Apostle himself; they were read out, and finally deposited among the archives of the Church; they were taken out on solemn days and read as sacred documents, with a perpetual teaching (Dionys. Corinth. in Euseb. 'H. E.' iv. 23). Thus the *epistolary* form of literature was peculiarly the shape into which Apostolic thought was thrown—a form well adapted to the wants of the time and to the temperament and character of St. Paul. (See Renan, 'St. Paul,' p. 223 *sqq.*)

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on *v.* 23.

**23.** According to Jewish views, the *soul* in this division might stand for *will*. Rabbis assigned this meaning to נפש in Gen. xxvii. 8; Deut. xxi. 14; 2 Chron. xxviii. 9; Ps. xxvii. 12; xli. 2. It is also used for understanding, thinking faculty (Deut. iv. 9; 1 Sam. xx. 4; Prov. xix. 2; Ps. cxxxix. 14; Lamentat. iii. 20). If this be so we shall have (1) *body*, including flesh, for carnal and creature appetites; (2) *soul*, for will, faculty of choice; (3) *spirit*, or upper soul, with true reason, the gift of the Spirit. See the lengthened and interesting quotations in Hammond, 'N. T.' p. 674, and cf. St. Hieron. Quæst. xi. ad Helvid.

Digitized by Google

# THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE

# THESSALONIANS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

*1 Saint Paul certifieth them of the good opinion which he had of their faith, love, and patience: 11 and therewithal useth divers reasons for the comforting of them in persecution, whereof the chiefest is taken from the righteous judgment of God.*

PAUL, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ:

2 Grace unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

3 We are bound to thank God always for you, brethren, as it is meet, because that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the charity of every one of you all toward each other aboundeth;

4 So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure:

5 *Which is* a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer:

6 Seeing *it is* a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you;

7 And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his[1] mighty angels,

8 In flaming fire [1]taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:

9 Who shall be punished with

1 Gr. *the angels of his power.*

1 Or, *yielding.*

---

CHAP. I.—1, 2. See *supra*, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2.

*We are bound.*] ὀφείλομεν, morally obliged: a favourite word of St. John. See *inf.* ii. 13.

*as it is meet*] "Many pleonastic expressions of St. Paul, it has been said, border on *tautology*; but with him tautology is often *emphasis*" (Prof. Jowett). There is, however, no tautology here. It is our bounden duty, meet and right, because we have a worthy cause.

*we ourselves.*] Spontaneously, on our own account (cf. 1 Thess. i. 9).

5. *a manifest token.*] In apposition with what precedes. Their faith and patience was the token.

6, 7. *tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled.*] (τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν, καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις.) This is a prominent instance of one of the main faults of our A.V.—various renderings of the same word or words in the same context, and hence the introduction of unreal distinctions which have no foundation in the original, with the manifold train of sophisms of ignorance. To **them that are afflicting you affliction**, and to you that **are being afflicted** (or, who bear your afflictions), rest.

*rest.*] *Rest* is appropriately opposed to affliction as *relaxation* to *pressure*, the loosening to the *tightening* grasp. The same antithesis in 2 Cor. vii. 5, viii. 13. "*Relaxati*, sc. a pressurâ hujus vitæ."—(Est.)

8. *In flaming fire*] (See note at close of chapter.)

(1) *that know not God, and* (2) *obey not the Gospel*] (1) refers to *Gentiles*; (2) to *Jews*.

*obey not the gospel*] In the Pauline Epistles faith is frequently called obedience. *Here*, faith in *objective Revelation* seems to be recognised. No soul believes the supernatural mysteries revealed by God, unless by a

Digitized by Google

everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;

10 When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.

11 Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would [1]count you worthy of *this* calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of *his* goodness, and the work of faith with power:

12 That the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] Or, *vouchsafe.*

---

submission of his will he brings his *intellectual* faculties into captivity to the obedience of Christ (2 Cor. x. 5). Intellectual submission is a part of Christian trial and Christian obedience (St. August. 'de G. et Lib. Arbit.' c. 3).

**9.** *Who*] (οἵτινες.) *Quippe qui*, "inasmuch as they."

*shall suffer* **as punishment** *eternal destruction.*] "Eternal destruction;" Theophyl. not unnaturally asks, "How then do the Origenists make for themselves a myth of an end of the punishment?—*Eternal* is what Paul calls it." On the whole question, see Bp. Ellicott's references, 'Destiny of Creature,' Sermon iv. For the word αἰώνιος, see note at the close of commentary upon this epistle.

**10.** (1) *Saints.* (2) All *them that believe. Saints*, in modern language, is generally used as equivalent to the exceptionally holy, those who enjoy an ecclesiastical patent of spiritual nobility. It has often been pointed out that it is not so in St. Paul's Epistles generally; yet here, perhaps, there is a trace of the modern shade of thought. The "*all*," coupled with "them that *believed*," might seem to hint that the word "believed" has a more *extensive*, the word "saint" a more *intensive*, meaning. (See Bengel.)

*because our testimony among you was believed.*] These words are explanatory of "believed." To be admired in all those who **believed**, made their act of faith. Yes, even so, *believed;* for assuredly that witness of ours, stretching on even unto you in the far west, was believed.

*to be glorified in his saints,*] "The admirable glory of Christ will manifest itself through the saints" (Bengel). In this passage St. Paul uses precisely the same intensely *mystical* language which we find in St. John. It is almost impossible to consider the declaration in the high-priestly prayer of Jesus ("I have been glorified in them," δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς. St. John xvii. 10; cf. vii. 39), and compare it with the present verse (ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ), without being convinced that the Apostle is drinking from the same source as the Evangelist. To "glorify" Christ is to make His glory known; to "acknowledge Him as being what He is" (see on St. John xii. 28; xvii. 10). Note the force of the aor. (ἐνδοξασθῆναι). The faint and intermittent glorifications of Christ, broken and suspended on earth, are over. He comes to be "glorified" by the one great decisive act of their bright and unending life.

*to be admired.*] (θαυμασθῆναι). The English word "admired" is used in the archaic sense of "being wondered at;" not as the feeling of joyful appreciation with which we contemplate beautiful objects.

*in that day.*] To be joined with "when He shall come." Possibly, however, the verse may be taken, so that "in that day" is to be connected immediately with the preceding words—"because our testimony and preaching was faithfully received by you—a testimony having its sphere and object in *that day*" (sc. the day referred to in "when He shall come" at the beginning of the v.).

**11.** *fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness.*] (πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης.) Four different explanations of these words have been given: (1) "All *gladness in goodness*," *both* being *theirs*; (2) "All *gladness* of *goodness*," *i.e.* all God's *goodness* wherein *He delights*—*both* being *His;* (3) "All *His* good pleasure in *our* goodness"—the *first* being *His*, the second *theirs* ("the loving will of God, that we should do all good" (Theophyl.)); (4) "All the good pleasure of His goodness," both being God's. Whichever modification be adopted, the explanation (1) must be set aside, as εὐδοκία, according to Scripture usage, is always *God's* "good pleasure."

**12.** St. Paul states the *final ends* of his prayer—("that our God may count you worthy of **the calling**, and fulfil all **good pleasure of Divine goodness**, and **faith's work in power**")—to be twofold: (1) That the graces of the Thessalonians should cause Christ's name to be glorified, by its being seen that Christ was the author of them. ("When men see true Christians they will say—Christ is so *good* that His people can die for Him, so *powerful* that He can strengthen them with patience."—Theophyl. We might say, so good that they can *die* for Him, so strong that they can *live* for Him.) (2) As a

Digitized by Google

secondary end, that they in time should be glorified in Christ, through Christ, now or hereafter. As the holiness of His people brings glory to Christ, so the glory of Christ makes them glorious. Thus the twofold end is secured: (1) *Christ* is glorified in them; (2) *they* are glorified in Christ. And, in order to take away all merit from man, he adds, "according to the grace of our God and Lord Jesus Christ" (see note at end of chapter), of Him who as God is the giver of all free and glorious largess, and as Lord Jesus Christ has won it. All this mighty faith-work—with its twofold effect:—(1) Christ's name, Christ as manifested being glorified in them, (2) their being glorified in Him—comes from the free gift of Jesus, our God and Lord, not from ourselves. Note in "the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" here another instance of the word as denoting true *personality*. It is never used of *qualities*, only of *persons* (cf. St. Matt. xxviii. 20).

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 8, 12.

**8.** There is much difficulty in deciding here between the almost equally supported readings ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς (Text. Rec. with ℵ, B, D) and ἐν φλογὶ πυρός (with D, E, F, G). The Text. Rec. is preferred by Tischend. and Reiche. Φλὸξ πυρὸς is, indeed, commonest in Old Test., Exod. iii. 2 (where, however, readings vary); Ps. xxix. 7; Isaiah xxix. 6, lxvi. 15; Dan. vii. 9; Joel ii. 5. It is almost universal in New Test. (Heb. i. 7; Apoc. i. 14, ii. 18, xix. 12; Acts vii. 30 is doubtful.) In secular writers φ. π. is invariable; it is, therefore, more probable that scribes would change the rarer into the more common phrase. It was not unknown to Hellenists (Exod. iii. 2, in some copies cf. Ps. civ. 3; Lamentat. ii. 3; see also Samuel viii. 10, xlv. 26; Ps. Salom. xii. 5.) This later Hellenistic usage St. Paul might be likely to follow: πῦρ φλογὸς ("fire of flame, i.e. fire, driving and spreading flame") is also more difficult and Hebraic than φλὸξ πυρὸς, flame of fire, *flamma ignea*.

**12.** *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* The most probable and natural interpretation is given in the note above. According to Granville Sharpe's well-known canon, the τοῦ would indicate the identity of the anarthrous κυρίου with the previous Θεοῦ to which it is joined by the conj. καί. Κύριος, however, often occurs like Θεός without the article, *particularly* when in gen. or preceding Ἰ. Χ. (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; iii. 20), so that no *certain* inference can be drawn. (Winer, 'Gr. Gr.' part iii. § xiv. p. 136.)

## CHAPTER II.

1 *He willeth them to continue stedfast in the truth received,* 3 *sheweth that there shall be a departure from the faith,* 9 *and a discovery of antichrist, before the day of the Lord come.* 15 *And thereupon repeateth his former exhortation, and prayeth for them.*

NOW we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and *by* our gathering together unto him,

2 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by

**1.** *by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him.*] St. Paul here, probably, does not use an adjuration ("by"—A.V.), nor indicate a fresh subject of discussion ("touching"—this would be περί, as in 1 Thess. iv. 9–13, v. 1), but ὑπέρ. "I ask you, as an advocate for the truth concerning the Coming"—on **behalf of** the Advent—"as if pleading for the honour of the Day, that it might not be a cause of confusion in the Church." (Professor Jowett.) "As the protecting champion fought *over* as well as *before* his friend, we find ὑπέρ with gen. in the sense "on behalf of" (Donaldson, 'Gr. Gram.' 513.) Above all, that the Church should not be committed to a *mistake*—cf. Ps. xcvi. 13; xcvii. 5.

*our gathering together unto him.*] That which is spoken of in 1 Thess. iv. 17. There is, no doubt, a reference to the expression of our Lord—"Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." St. Luke xvii. 37. The word itself means (1) the act of congregating together in one spot—"I beseech you on behalf of the great hope of our being gathered together unto the Lord." But (2) it also signifies the multitude, the congregation itself thus gathered (cf. Heb. x. 25, and especially the remarkable verse 2 Macc. ii. 7)—in which sense we should understand, "And for the honour of that universal gathering of all God's people to Christ, of which we shall form part."

Digitized by Google

spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

3 Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first,

---

2. *With a view to* **your being not quickly shaken from your sober mind, *nor* yet be troubled.**] Bp. Ellicott. "De ne pas vous monter trop promptement la tête, et de ne vous laisser effrayer." (Renan, 'Saint Paul,' p. 251.) "Suddenly shaken from that sense, understanding nothing of the Parousia which he had impressed upon them" (Hammond). [νοῦς means definite conviction, deliberate opinion, settled judgment, Rom. xv. 5; 1 Cor. i. 10; so Bretsch. Grimm understands it to denote faculty of considering things quietly, justly, and gravely. Estius paraphrases: "Be not quickly moved away from that doctrine upon the subject which ye hold in your mind as ye have received it from us."]

*neither by* (1) *spirit, nor by* (2) *word, nor by* (3) **epistle, *as* addressed to you through us.**] (1) Supernatural impulse; (2) ordinary instruction; (3) cf. *infra*, v. 15; iii. 14. These passages show the high authority of Apostolic Epistles in the primitive Church (cf. 1 Thess. v. 27), and bear upon their position in the Canon of the New Testament. The Epistle was held to have an authority equal to that of the Apostle himself. It was to be read publicly in Church worship. (See M. Renan's interesting remarks on Epistles, in 'Saint Paul,' pp. 228, 229.)

*to the effect that "the Day of the Lord is on us."*] (ὡς ὅτι—the ὅτι of quotation—ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τ. κ.) (The perf. part. of this verb is elsewhere used as grammatically equivalent to the present—Heb. ix. 9: cf. Rom. viii. 38; Gal. i. 4.) The expression is here very vivid, and denotes close propinquity. Spiritual impulse, ministerial teaching, Epistle forged as if coming to the Church through St. Paul, or else genuine Epistle misunderstood, produced this effect, that men cried—"the day of the Lord is upon us." The great importance of this passage will be seen in relation to the current view that the Apostles are fatally committed to an actual mistake upon the immediate propinquity of the Second Advent. This importance is increased by the fact that these Epistles are the very earliest extant writings of St. Paul. The Apostle, therefore, did not labour under an illusion, which was only removed by a prolonged experience. It is surely startling that precisely the same mistake appears to be made by M. Renan and other writers of his school at the present time, which was committed by the Thessalonians more than eighteen hundred years ago. In 1 Thess. (v. 1) St. Paul speaks of the Day coming "as a thief," and how "sudden destruction cometh upon them." "This," says Hammond, "was mistaken; and the *suddenness* and *unobservedness* of it when it should come, interpreted to denote *immediate instant approach* of it at that time wherein he spake." ('N. T.,' p. 679.) Their error was changing the warning of true prophecy, caught from the lips of Christ Himself (1 Thess. v. 3), into the fanatical cry "The Day of the Lord is on us" (2 Thess. ii. 2). This error was grounded upon three plausible arguments: (1) revelation by the Spirit—the Spirit of Prophecy; (2) teaching, probably alleged teaching, discourses and affirmations said to have for a basis others uttered by St. Paul himself; (3) misinterpretation of 1 Thess. v. 3, explaining ἐφίσταται erroneously by ἐνέστηκεν—as though he had thus taught, either by word of mouth, or through an epistle, or both. He distinctly appeals to their own recollection of the whole tenor of his teaching, "when I was yet with you" (*inf.* v. 5). Their embracing any such teaching was, according to St. Paul, a mischievous and contemptible fanaticism — a "being quickly shaken from their own sober judgment."

3. *Let* **no man deceive** *you*] "St. Paul often admonisheth us, as if it were in our power if we would but use requisite care thereunto to prevent our being deceived; and as if it were our fault most if we did not prevent it. (Ephes. v. 6; Coloss. ii. 4, 8, 11; 2 Thessal. ii. 3.)" Bp. Sanderson's Sermons, pp. 3 and 5.

*Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first.*] The A. V. supplies the substantive meaning rightly by the words in Italics—*that day shall not come.* See Additional Note.

*a falling away*] The **falling away** (ἡ ἀποστασία — "la *grande Apostasie*," Renan). The word is often applied to desertion of the true religion and true God (cf. ἀποστασίαν διδάσκειν ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως, Acts xxi. 21; and ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Heb. iii. 12).

*the Man of Sin.*] On the Man of Sin, see note at close of the chapter.

*of sin.*] In whom the principle of sin is so completely inherent, that it seems to take concrete form in, and to be inseparable from, him (gen. of "predominating quality"). There appears to have been a tendency to personification in the scriptural conception of sin from the very beginning (Gen. iv. 7. See

Digitized by Google

and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;

4 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.

---

Additional Note at end of the chapter). The same almost personal conception of sin appears in our Lord's teaching (S. John viii. 34), and runs through the whole of the Epistle to the Romans (v. 21; vi. 6, 12, 14; vii. 17, 20; cf. "the strength of sin," 1 Cor. xv. 56).

*be revealed.*] Part of his elaborate parody of Christ. A veil is to be lifted, and he is to be seen. He has, like Christ, his *apocalypse*.

*the son of perdition.*] (See S. John xvii. 12). One by his crimes fitted for death, and sure to be destroyed. David calls the man who shall surely die בֶּן־מָוֶת, "a son of death" (2 Sam. xii. 5). The Man of Sin is a very incarnation of "self-destroying evil."

4. *Who opposeth and* **exalteth himself exceedingly.**] "He that opposeth and exalteth himself." The whole language here leads us to a person, an individual man, not to some spiritual power contrary to the Gospel, or to a long line of adversaries of Christ. The characteristic of "opposition" is literally *satanic*; but Chrysost. well observes, "Is this Satan? Not so in fact, but some *one man* who receives the full energy of Satan's power."

**Against** (not *above*, A.V., ἐπὶ πάντα) **every one** *that is called God or* **object of worship.**] Commentators have naturally turned to the words in Daniel,—"and the King shall do according to his will, and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every God" (xi. 36). S. Jerome's exposition of that passage is worth attentive study. He speaks of the reference in it to Antichrist as being the common interpretation of Christendom. He by no means denies, but rather asserts a certain fulfilment in Antiochus Epiphanes. But he points to a principle of *concentration* and *enlargement* in the two great opposing figures which tower above all others upon the prophetic canvas, Christ and Antichrist. The prophets start from the conception of a human type of Christ; as they proceed they paint with bolder strokes upon an ampler scale, until the original starting-point of historical reality is lost in the boundless magnificence of the ideal. Thus the shape of Solomon in the 72nd Psalm passes into the grander ideal King who shall have dominion from sea to sea, before whom all kings shall fall down. There is a partial shadowing forth, an imperfect beginning, in Solomon of that which is fulfilled in Christ. "As therefore our Saviour has both Solomon, and others of old time, as a type of His coming—so Antichrist also, it is to be believed, rightly had the wicked king, Antiochus, who persecuted the saints, and defiled the temple, as his type." (S. Hieron. 'Comment. in Daniel. Proph.,' tom. v. 711–718).

*so that he* [*as God*—these two words should be omitted] **taketh his seat** *in the temple of God*, **showing himself off** *that he is God.*] "Goeth and taketh his seat" (εἰς τὸν ναὸν καθίσαι). The prep. connected with the verb "to take his seat" implies entrance into God's House. See 'Is the Papacy predicted?' Bp. Wordsworth, pp. 4, 5. May it not imply entrance by an external and hostile influence? In the *Temple* of God (εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ) as distinguished from the Holy of Holies within, and from the mere Temple-courts or enclosure which surrounded it (ἱερόν). [The distinction between the two words is very fully given by Josephus. The whole pile of buildings was the ἱερόν, and consisted of three ranges. The first or outer led to the second ἱερόν, which consisted of halls or courts, from which there was an entrance into the Temple itself, consisting of two parts, the Holy and the Holy of Holies. This third range was the ναός.] It should be noticed that it is this word, meaning the 'inner shrine,' which S. Paul applies to Christians, collectively and singly. (1 Corinth. iv. 16, 17, vi. 19; 2 Corinth. vi. 16; Ephes. ii. 21; Joseph. 'Antiq.,' xv. 11; 'De Bell. J.' v. 5, 8, vi. 4.) Expositors here have taken two different views: (1) Some suppose that S. Paul speaks of the actual temple at Jerusalem—whether as then standing—or as restored in the future (Ezek. xxxvii. 26); (2) Others (with Chrys.) take it "for the Christian Churches everywhere" (cf. Ephes. ii. 21).

**showing himself off.**] (ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτόν). The word seems to be specially used of those who, after being designated by themselves or others to office, appeared before the people to show themselves. 1 Cor. iv. 9 (see Bretsch. s. v.).

The ambitious *self-designation* of the Man of Sin is indicated. *Contrast* the *designation by God* of Jesus (Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Acts ii. 22). "He will consummate all idolatry, by causing the world to believe that all worship whatever is abolished. He will *contradict the true God* by *contradicting all Deity whatever*. He will rivet all worship to Himself as being the perfect specimen of the independence of man." (Edward Irving, 'Morning Watch,' iv. 257).

*or that is worshipped;*] (σέβασμα, "object

Digitized by Google

5 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?

6 And now ye know what ¹withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.

¹ Or, holdeth.

7 For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way.

8 And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:

---

of reverence," "what is reverenced or worshipped.") It seems plausible to remark that the title of the Roman Emperor comes very near to this word (τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, cf. *Augustus*, Acts xxi. 23), and to conjecture that the Cæsarism, which was politically the most conspicuous feature of Rome, may have been in St. Paul's time, the chief σέβασμα of the world. (Cf. Daniel xi. 36, 38.) But this is at variance with the use of the word, Acts xxii. 23.

5. *Remember you not that . . . . I* **was wont** *to* **tell you.**] One of the traditions, which passed into the thought and memory of the Church. St. John speaks in the same tone of Antichrist: "Ye have heard of Antichrist's solemn predestined coming' (1 St. John ii. 18).

6. The greatest of the Christian fathers held that the Roman Empire was the withholding power, and that St. Paul's reserve here was the result of prudence and charity. Thus St. Jerome says (qu. xi. ad. Algasiam), "*If* St. Paul had written openly and boldly 'that the Man of Sin would not come' until the Roman Empire was destroyed, a just cause of persecution would then appear to have been afforded against the Church in her infancy." St. Chrysostom also here says, "If St. Paul had said that the Roman Empire will soon be dissolved, the heathen would have destroyed him as a rebel and all the faithful with him, as persons who took up arms against the State. "But (adds Chrysostom in his Exposition) St. Paul *means* the Roman Empire. And when that shall have been taken away, then the Man of Sin will come. For as the power of Babylon was dissolved by the Persian Dynasty, and the Persian was supplanted by the Greek, and the Greek by the Roman, so the Roman will be dissolved by Antichrist, and Antichrist by Christ." (Quoted by Bp. Wordsworth.)

*what withholdeth.*] (τὸ κατέχον.) Cf. the same word in the next verse, in the masculine (ὁ κατέχων, 'he who letteth,' A. V.). It is generally said that a *hindrance* of Antichrist is here spoken of; and it is argued by some that the hindrance may be regarded indifferently as a thing or a person, from the change of gender. This, however, is altogether a deduction of modern logic. The first may be merely the second viewed *collectively* and *generally* (the *generalising* neuter). The meaning of *hindrance* is also somewhat precarious. It is maintained, not without force, that the verb does not properly mean "withhold, let, hinder," but "hold fast, possess." (See Bengel, "Sunt qui interpretantur de *obtinente imperium*." See the discussion in Döllinger, 'First Age of the Church,' ii. 91, note.)

**in order** *that he may be revealed.*] God's purpose in the restraint, that he may be revealed in **his own season**—not before.

7. *For the mystery of* **the lawlessness** (sc. which I am about to describe) *is already inworking.*] See the opposite "mystery of godliness" (1 Tim. iii. 16). Cf. for the presence of Antichrist, even in the primitive church, 1 St. John ii. 17; iv. 3. "Hidden in the womb of the age, the power of life is waiting to be quickened—a mystery still—as the believer's hidden life is a mystery." (Professor Jowett.)

**lawlessness.**] In contrast to the moral restraint implied in "withhold." The essential idea of ἀνομία is sin as violation of *law*. Bp. Wordsworth considers that the chief difficulties of the verse are removed by bearing in mind that there should be no comma in the Greek after (ἀνομίας) "lawlessness," but that "only" is to be connected with "worketh inwardly" ("works inwardly only"), and that "now" is antithetical to "and then" (v. 8.), and "now working inwardly," to "being hereafter revealed outwardly" (v. 8). ('Is the Papacy predicted?' &c., p. 6.)

8. *that Wicked.*] (ὁ ἄνομος.) **The lawless One**) *Illex*, used by Plautus. (Like the Heb. רשע, ἀσεβής, LXX., Isaiah xi. 4.)

*whom the Lord.*] There is very considerable external authority for adding after Lord, *Jesus* (so א, A, D). The sacred names of our Lord are used as follows in this Epistle: (1) The Lord J. C., 2 Thess. i. 1, 2, 8, 12; ii. 1, 14, 16; iii. 6, 12, 18. (2) The Lord, 2 Thess. i. 9; ii. 2, 13; iii. 1, 3, 4, 5, 16. (3) The Lord Jesus, 2 Thess. i. 7, added for the sake of perspicuity. (In 2 Thess. i. 8-12, some omit "Christ.")

*with the breath of His mouth.*] Cf. Ps. xxxii. 16; Isaiah xi. 4.



Digitized by Google

9 *Even him*, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,

10 And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

11 And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:

12 That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

13 But we are bound to give

---

*with the brightness of his coming:*] *Illustratione adventûs sui* (Vulg.). "The bright appearance of the Advent is prior to, or, at least, the first radiation from the Advent itself." (Beng.) With these words cf. the half-line of Milton, which so deeply impressed the imagination of Wordsworth:

"Far off His coming shone."

It may be taken, however, not exactly as a vivid picture of the full reality, but as implying that the *mere appearing* of His Parousia will destroy the lawless one. "Coming" ('Επιφάνεια) in N. T. signifies (1) the First Advent, with its saving light (2 Tim. i. 10); (2) the glorious return (1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8).

*with all.*] The "all" refers to all the substantives—all power, all signs, all wonders. So "lying" signifies power of lying, signs of lying, wonders of lying. Note how many words in these verses bring out the hellish caricature of our Saviour—(ἀποκαλυφθῇ, v. 3, v. 6, v. 8; μυστήριον, v. 7, παρουσία, v. 9; and with δυνάμει, σημείοις, τέρασιν, cf. the σημείοις, τέρασιν, δυνάμεσιν of Jesus in Acts ii. 22. Heb. ii. 10. The most exhaustive enumeration of our Lord's miracles is parodied.

*in all* **deceit** *of unrighteousness* **for** *them* **that are perishing.**] "The dat. implies that the falsehood has a natural and congenial effect on them." See Additional Note at the end of the chapter.

**11.** *God shall send them.*] So A. V.; preferable to "doth send." The latter is considered to be a vivid prophetic present, and the present tenses in vv. 7, 9 are appealed to. But vv. 7, 9, 10, are in sense almost parenthetic; and verse 11 is not connected with them, but with verses 8, 12. (See Reiche, 'Comm. Crit.' in loc.)

*strong delusion*] This fine and vigorous phrase expresses the interpretation of Œcum. —rather, however, "an inner working of error" — nothing external, but something which they bring upon, and feel within, themselves. (Bp. Wordsworth, *l. c.* p. 7.)

*that they should believe* **the lie.**] Referring to verse 9.

**12.**] That they might **be judged**, all collectively, who have not believed the truth, but have taken their pleasure in the unrighteousness (sc. of the Man of Sin). The condemnation of those who belong to the Man of Sin is not because they have been *deceived* intellectually, but because the deception by which they are entangled has its life and power in a corrupted *will*, which is attracted by and revels in the *unrighteousness* of the anti-Christian system. "He exposes the temper which makes people unbelievers, because they are sinners." (Keble, 'Stud. S.,' p. 235).

The most marked features in this passage, vers. 3–12, are these—(a) A caricature of *Christ*; (b) A caricature of *Christianity*.

(a) A caricature, an exact counterpart and mockery of *Christ* in the Man of Sin.

The Man of Sin has, like Christ,

1. An *Apocalypse* (ἀποκαλυφθῇ, v. 3), cf. vers. 6–8.
2. A *solemn coming* upon the stage of human history (ἔλθῃ, v. 3).
3. An *Advent* (οὗ ἡ παρουσία—v. 9).
4. *Power*, *signs*, *wonders* (v. 9).
5. *Designation* (v. 4).
6. A definitely appointed *season of his own* (ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ—v. 6).

(b) A caricature, a mockery and counterpart of *Christianity* in the *anti-Christianity* of the Man of Sin. As some of the leading glories of Christ are studiously travestied in the "lawless one," and described in language which forces us to think of *Christ;* so several of the leading features of the *Christian system* are powerfully travestied by imitative *anti-Christianity*.

1. *Anti-Christianity* is a *mystery* (v. 7) imitative of the *mystery* of godliness.
2. Anti-Christianity has an *energy*, an inworking (τὸ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται, v. 7; ἐνέργειαν πλάνης, v. 11; cf. Ephes. ii. 2), imitative of the *energy*, the inworking, of the word of God (1 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. iv. 12), of God (Philip. ii. 13; Galat. ii. 8), of the indwelling Spirit (Coloss. i. 29). "He shall work in them by such an energy as that of the Holy Ghost, who witnesseth in us concerning God; not a mere apprehension, but an inworking of error, a regeneration into the faith of *the lie*" (Edward Irving, 'Morning Watch,' iv. 256, 259).
3. Anti-Christianity has a *faith*—a solemn making of an act of faith—imitative of the faith of Christians (v. 11).

Digitized by Google

thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth:

14 Whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

15 Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.

16 Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given *us* everlasting consolation and good hope through grace,

17 Comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.

---

4. The words *εὐδοκεῖν, εὐδοκία*, are used of God's good pleasure in His sinless Son, and of His good-will to men (St. Matt. iii. 17; xii. 18; xvii. 5; St. Luke xii. 32; 1 Cor. i. 21; Galat. i. 15), or of the good-will of Christians in holiness and acts of love (1 Thess. ii. 8, *κ. τ. λ.*). The imitative "good pleasure" of anti-Christianity is in unrighteousness, as God is well-pleased in Christ, or God's servants in good (*εὐδοκήσαντες ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ*, v. 12).

13. *hath from the beginning.*] So A. V. rightly, reading *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (not *ἀπαρχήν* "chosen you as *a first-fruit*"). *'Απ' ἀρχῆς* has much external authority. (ℵ, A, D, E, *κ. τ. λ.*) The "from the beginning" (ab initio rerum) is quite in place here. While to some copyists it might appear difficult, it is quite in accordance with our Lord's lofty words (St. Matt. xxv. 34). On *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, see note on 1 St. John i. 1.

*chosen you.*] The verb here is remarkable. Not as elsewhere (*ἐξελέξατο*), but here alone for this idea *εἵλετο* from *αἱρέομαι* (Midd.) "**take to Himself.**" Cf. Deut. xxvi. 18 (LXX).

*through sanctification of the Spirit.*] "In (*ἐν*) sanctification" is the criterion of God's "choosing to Himself."

14. *whereunto* (*εἰς ὅ*, unto *all which* (i.e. choice to Himself from the beginning; salvation in spiritual sanctification; and belief in truth.

*the obtaining of the glory of our Lord J. C.*] There are three possible shades of meaning to be found in these words. (1) God hath chosen you for the purpose of an acquisition of glory to our Lord J. C. (2) For a glorious possession of our Lord. (3) Most probably as in A. V. (*περιποίησιν, acquisition*, with gen. of things acquired; 1 Thess. v. 9. Grimm, 'Lex. N. T.')

15. "Unconscious of what we should call *logical inconsistency*, he immediately adds, *stand fast*" (Prof. Jowett).] "Standing fast," because God hath chosen us to Himself for the purpose of acquiring salvation, is, at once, logical and spiritual consistency.

*the traditions which ye* **were taught**, *whether by word, or by our Epistle.*] "God *hands down* to us by the Ministers of the Gospel. *Tradition* of this kind is a great benefit" (Bengel).

16. *our Lord Jesus Christ himself.*] Again the majestic *αὐτὸς*—(*αὐτός δέ, ὁ κ. ἡμῶν 'I. X.*) "**He** our Lord Jesus Christ," cf. 1 Thess. iii. 16. Chrysostom invites the special attention of those who deny the co-equal Divinity of the Son, because He is named after the Father in the baptismal formula. Here He stands first.

*everlasting consolation.*] "A consolation reaching to the life that now is, and to that which is to come" (Prof. Jowett.)

17. *Comfort your hearts.*] *Comfort* (*παρακαλέσαι*), *singular* and opt. Cf. the similar junction of "our Lord Jesus Christ," and "God the Father," with a verb in the *singular* 1 Thess. iii. 11. For the dogmatic bearing of these words—in which the Persons of the Son and the Father are distinguished, while the identity of their operation ad *extra* is declared—see Introduction.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on *v.* 3.

3. חַטָּאת רֹבֵץ (Gen. iv. 7) "sin couches" —where the feminine substantive is construed with a masculine participle, because it is personified as the enemy in ambush, like a wild beast— "sin is he who couches."

*that day shall not come, except there come.*] ["Relative particles give a precise expression to every sort of temporal sentence. The antecedent is sometimes expressed, sometimes contained in the tense of the verb. In the adverbial sentence after *πρίν* we may use either indicative, subjunctive, optative, or infinitive—



Digitized by Google

the subjunctive only after a negative sentence, of an act both probable and future, almost always with the particle ἄν. After a *future*, Sophoc. 'Œd. C.' 1040, Diphilus (*apud Athen.*, p. 291, B.), whence we may explain the well-known ellipse in St. Paul, 2 Thess ii. 3; ὅτι, ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον [οὐ δύναται ἐλθεῖν ὁ Κύριος]."—Donaldson, 'Gr. Gram.' 583.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on the Man of Sin, ii. 3, *seqq.*

The object of a Commentary like the present is mainly to make the thoughts of the sacred writers more intelligible by means of a careful study of their language. It is not, therefore, our intention to attempt a full history of the interpretation of this very difficult passage. Such an attempt would almost require a volume, very largely filled with subtleties and eccentricities.

It may be said broadly that there have been four great schools of interpretation in reference to the Man of Sin.

1 By the Fathers generally it was conjectured that "that which withholdeth" was the Roman Empire—that the Man of Sin would be manifested after the fall of the Empire—that he would appear as a Jewish Messiah, in a rebuilt Temple—and by many that Nero was the "mystery of iniquity.[1]"—In the Greek Church, the discussion by John of Damascus has occupied the highest place. This writer keeps the Apocalyptic beast perfectly distinct from the "Man of Sin." From our Lord's words,—"if another shall come in his own name, him will ye receive"[2]—he infers, with Chrysostom (see Introduction, ii. 6 b) that the Jews would certainly accept the Man of Sin as their Messiah. The Temple where he receives adoration is the Jewish Temple. The offspring of shameful lust, yet gifted with extraordinary endowments, and possessing Satanic power, he will persecute the Church; but will only succeed in carrying away the feeble-minded and false by his lying wonders.[3]

2. In the Middle Ages there were, from time to time, vague expectations of Antichrist, but almost uniformly from the East. The idea of the Man of Sin was called out by Eastern, not by Western, history. Wicliffe (in the *Last Age of the Church*) assigned the date of A.D. 1400 for the coming of Antichrist. This great man, like many others, called the Pope Antichrist, or an Antichrist. But the intention was not to *interpret* the Pauline Man of Sin *dogmatically* of the Papacy. It was held that a Jew was to appear, in whom the prophecy was to be absolutely fulfilled.

3. With the older school of Protestant prophetic interpretations a great change came. The view, inherited from the Fathers, which concentrated the mystery of lawlessness in a single individual was set aside. The mystery was dispersed through a long succession, a regular dynasty, of Antichrists. This interpretation was supported by Melanchthon,[4] and received into Protestant Confessions. What acceptance it obtained in England may be inferred from two significant facts. The dedication of the translators of the Bible to King James assumes that the Pope, as such, is the Man of Sin.[5] One of the accusations against Archbishop Laud upon his trial was that he denied the Pope to be the Man of Sin.[6]

Views of interpretation, held by able schools of writers, so pious and learned, must each possess some measure of truth. The best

---

[1] The references to Irenæus, Lactantius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, will be found in Döllinger, 'First Age of the Church,' ii. pp. 267–277.

[2] St. John, v. 43.

[3] 'De Fide Orthod.' iv. 26.

[4] "As Paul moulds the conception of Antiochus to the kingdom which dominates in the church, i. e., which retains the title of the Church, I, for my part, shall follow Paul, and accommodate this prophecy concerning Antiochus to the pontifical dominion."—Melanchthon, 'Opp.,' ii. 452.

[5] "By writing in defence of the truth, which hath given such a blow unto that Man of Sin, as will not be healed."

[6] 'State Trials,' vol. iv. pp. 524–5–6. "*2nd charge of 18th day of hearing.*—'Out of a letter of mine (Laud's) to Bishop Hall, upon a letter which he had formerly sent me.' He asked Laud, and gave him power to alter or cancel anything which he disapproved of. Of this full power he did not avail himself, but submitted to the Bishop's better judgment the altering of some passages: one of which was, that the Pope was 'Antichrist,' which Archbishop disliked. (*This* was strongly dwelt upon in the charge.)

"*19th day.*—They went on with this charge regarding the Pope.

"*5th charge of 19th day.*—Denial of Homilies which authorize the title of Pope to 'Antichrist,' and the 'Babylonical Beast.'

"*19th day of my hearing.*—Charge 4. Particular 6.—The 6th particular was the Article of Ireland, which calls the Pope the *Man of Sin.* But the Articles of Ireland neither bind this Church nor me; and some learned Protestants do not understand that noted place of the Apostle (2 Thess. ii.) as meant of Antichrist or the Pope." Laud's own 'History of his Trial,' quoted in 'State Trials,' vol. iv. p. 543.

Digitized by Google

interpretation will probably be found in a combination of the strongest points presented by each school.

1. That Antichrist is an *individual*—the Man of Sin, the Lawless One—is, at least, the most natural view of St. Paul's words. It was held, apparently without exception, when the first traditions of Christianity were fresh in the minds of Christians, and does not seem to have been contested for 1500 years.

2. In the Middle Ages it was brought into prominent notice that false teachers and usurping prelates were shadows and reflections of Antichrist, and that there were times in the history of the See of Rome when an Antichrist sat in that haughty chair.

It is impossible to read, *e. g.*, Bishop Wordsworth's exposition[1] without being impressed by the formidable case which is made out against the Papacy. In the verses under consideration there are, at least, three distinct expressions which seem, at first, to point to a professedly Christian power: (*a.*) "The *Apostasy*" (ἡ ἀποστασία, v. 3) would appear to imply a departure from the Christian faith. (*b.*) "The *Son of Perdition*" might be taken as a reference to one fallen from the apostolate, a second Judas (ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, S. John, xvii. 12). (*c.*) The *Temple of God* might be construed as equivalent to the *Christian Church* (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Cor. vi. 16). Yet there is much to weaken the impression.

(*a*) ἀποστασία is used in the LXX of those who had never known God.[2] (*b*) The "son of perdition" is applied to any one doomed and self-fitted to perdition. (See above, on v. 3.) (*c*) The "Temple of God" (εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, v. 4) is the regular expression for the *Jewish Temple* (S. Matt. xxvi. 61. Josephus, *passim*).

Perhaps it may be safest, and most modest, to conclude that each great school of interpretation has something important to teach the church. The patristic expositors impress upon us the *individuality* of the lawless one.[3] The mediæval writers bring out the idea, not only that there are many Antichrists, each a type of the perfect incarnation of Lawlessness (which is a Scriptural and patristic idea), but that such types may be found in isolated Popes. The older Protestant interpreters, stimulated by the presence of abuses and tyranny, express strongly the existence of a permanently anti-Christian and lawless element in the system of the Papacy, which each Pope must, in a measure, represent.

But this view would be very deficient without some reference to a fourth school.

4. The school of early Protestant criticism, represented by Grotius, has done excellent service in recalling to us the thoughts which were actually in the mind of St. Paul. The reference to Antiochus Epiphanes as delineated by Daniel xi. 36, is beyond doubt. (See above on v. 4.) The mad and impious attempts of Caligula also haunt his imagination. The profanation of the Temple in which our Lord had walked, and which apostles had frequented, was as shocking to Christians as to Jews. Caligula, from whom great things were anticipated, had deceived the expecta-

---

[1] 'Is the Papacy predicted by St. Paul?' (2 Thess. ii. 1–13.) An Inquiry. By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. (Rivingtons, 1880.)

Few writers of the Church of England will venture to speak otherwise than with respect of a view which has been so widely received by our greatest divines. Bishop Wordsworth observes:—"In support of the statements made here and in my notes on the Apocalypse (Rev. xiii., xvii.), and of the conclusion now deduced from them, it may be well to remember that this conclusion is one which is sanctioned by the names of some of the holiest, wisest, most charitable, and judicious persons that have expounded the Word of Inspiration, particularly Bp. Jewel, Richard Hooker, Bp. Andrewes, and Bp. Sanderson, and the framers of the Authorized English Version of the Holy Bible; see their Dedication prefixed to the English Bible, where they speak of the 'Man of Sin;' and Bp. Jewel's Works, Portion ii. pp. 891–923, ed. Camb. 1847; Hooker, Sermon on Jude 17, pp. 841, 843; Bp. Andrewes, 'c. Bellarmin,' c. ix. and x. p. 220; Bp. Sanderson, i. p. 338; iii. pp. 13, 146, 161, 283; and both Houses of our Convocation, in 1606 (see Cardwell, 'Synodalia,' i. 379), which were as follows:—'If any man shall affirm that the intolerable pride of the Bishop of Rome, for the time still being, through the advancement of himself by many sleights, stratagems, and false miracles, over the Catholic Church, the *Temple of God*, as if he were God Himself; doth not argue him plainly to be the Man of Sin, mentioned by the Apostle, he doth greatly err.'" 'Is the Papacy predicted,' &c.? (pp. 24, 25). See also the very remarkable passages in Davison, 'Discourses on Prophecy' (p. 324).

[2] παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας ἐχθρῶν ἀνόμων ἀποστατῶν—Cantus Trium Puerorum. This is said of the Chaldeans who had never been worshippers of the true God. See the discussion in Grotius.—'De Antichristo,' Append. ad Comm. p. 23.

[3] Grotius assures us that this was really the view of many great foreign Protestant Reformers and divines. "Induced by these arguments Hieron. Zanchius felt that *one individual* was here delineated. I have often heard Casaubon and other eminent Protestants speaking to the same effect." 'De Antichristo,' Append. ad Comment., p. 9.

Digitized by Google

tions of mankind.[1] Josephus and Philo are full of horror. The mysterious, imageless, worship and golden splendour of the Temple fired the wild imagination of Caligula. He ordered his statue to be placed in that august sanctuary. He was, indeed, prevented from carrying these odious intentions into effect, but the general impression was one of abhorrence and terror.[2]

Now, if we bear this prophetical and historical groundwork in mind, we have a key to much, at least, of St. Paul's language. And with this we are to remember a general principle of prophetic interpretation. The Apostle, as a prophet, saw objects as men see them by night, when shapes and outlines may be visible, but relative distances cannot be estimated. Some fuller development of evil awaits the Church and the world—the complete embodiment of Daniel's idea of Antiochus, the consummated realization of the intentions of Caligula. How this may take place we can only surmise. How it can be connected with the Jewish Temple, we cannot even guess. But a philosophical deification of humanity (v. 4); a general loosing of the bonds which unite society in Christendom; a re-assertion of the utmost rights of the flesh, and subversion upon principle of the moral law (ὁ ἄνομος, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας); and all this summed up in a great and variously gifted man—may complete the awful hints of Daniel (viii. 11, 12) and of St. Paul. The Church will know in time. The revolving light of prophecy will circle round in due season. The lines that now seem to waver and to tremble as in water will fix into a definite form.[3]

---

[1] See Suetonius—"Exoptatissimus princeps. . Hactenus quasi de Principe; reliqua ut de monstro narranda sunt." Grotius, ad II. cap. II. ad Thessal. p. 11. μεταβαλὼν . . . μᾶλλον δὲ ἣν συνεσκίασεν αγριότητα τῷ πλάσματι τῆς ὑποκρίσεως ἀναφήνας. Philo, ap Grot. Ibid. pp. 12, 13.

[2] Ἱστᾶν αὐτοῦ ἀνδριάντα ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Joseph. ἀνατεθῆναι πάλιν κελεύει τόν ἀνδρίαντα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. Philo (quoted by Grotius—'De Antichristo,' pp. 20, 21.

[3] If the view taken in this note is not that of the English divines who have been cited just above, it may at least claim a general agreement with one of the very highest name. Archbishop Bramhall discusses "in what sense the English Church believes the Pope to be an Antichrist, in what sense not." He observes, "The name of Antichrist is taken sometimes more largely, sometimes more strictly. Largely, for every one that is an opposer of Christ (1 John ii. 18). In this sense we believe the Pope to be an *Antichrist*. Secondly, the name of Antichrist is sometimes used more strictly, and in a more eminent sense for *the* Antichrist; for "that Man of Sin, the Son of perdition" (2 Thess. ii. 3). And in the latter sense, it is disputed problematically among the Protestants, whether the Pope be that great Antichrist. Doubtless all the signs of Antichrist do agree to him, as to "sit in the Temple," or "upon the Temple of God," &c. So whether the one, or the other, or perhaps a third, the Protestants determine not; but leave private authors to their own opinions." (Bramhall's Works, vol. v. pp. 256, *seqq.*)

---

## CHAPTER III.

1 *He craveth their prayers for himself,* 3 *testifieth what confidence he hath in them,* 5 *maketh request to God in their behalf,* 6 *giveth them divers precepts, especially to shun idleness, and ill company,* 16 *and last of all concludeth with prayer and salutation.*

FINALLY, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord [1]may have *free* course, and be glorified, even as *it is* with you:

[1] Gr. *may run.*

2 And that we may be delivered

---

CHAP. III.—1. *Finally,*] (Τὸ λοιπὸν.) The word used by one who is rapidly proceeding to the end of what he has to say (Philipp. iii. 1, iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1). (*Quod superest.* Grotius.)

*that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified.*] There is a delicate reference here to the Psalter. It is as if St. Paul said, "Pray, that to me the Psalmist's word, the word of the Lord, may *run* (Ps. cxlvii. 15. ἕως τάχους δραμεῖται ὁ λόγος, LXX. יָרוּץ דְּבָרוֹ). The N. T. has other instances of this sense, almost running into distinct *personality* (Acts xiii. 48; 2 Tim. ii. 9, which much resembles this passage, Hebrews iv. 12, where the word is spoken of as living, and capable of living work, as the living are). That which is sent, and runs forth, and is not bound; which is glorified; which is heart-searching, and has life and has living energy; runs up into personality. It has been said that in St. Paul's language there is constantly but a "thin film" between the Holy Ghost, the Divine Personal Spirit, and the spirit in the believer's inmost being. And so, in St. Paul's conception, there is but a thin film between the word written, preached, concentrated in definite statements, and the living word of God who is God.

Digitized by Google

[1] Gr. *absurd.*

from [1]unreasonable and wicked men: for all *men* have not faith.

3 But the Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you, and keep *you* from evil.

4 And we have confidence in the Lord touching you, that ye both do and will do the things which we command you.

5 And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into [1]the patient waiting for Christ.

[1] Or, *the patience of Christ.*

6 Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus

---

*may have* **free course.**] It has been supposed that the expression so familiar in Latin Christendom, "*cursus* Evangelii," came from this.

*be glorified.*] Cf. for this expression, "They glorified the word of the Lord," Acts xiii. 48.

**2.** *And that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for* **it is not all that have faith.**] (Bp. Ellicott.) St. Paul's words here do not apply to Thessalonica, but to the place from which he wrote. Probably, he may aim at the "false brethren" and "false apostles" of 2 Cor. xi. 13, 26. It would apparently have more point to refer "it is not all that have faith" to those from whom faith might have been expected; those, therefore, who were not separated by a definite line from the Church. "Pray that we may be delivered from the unreasonable and wicked men, of whom ye know; for not of all whom you see entered into the pale of the Church is that faith which makes men truly Christians."

*from* **the** *unreasonable.*] (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων.) Hammond seems to give some ground for thinking that this adjective may refer to persons guilty of sins, which were a contradiction to the first dictates of natural feeling and instinctive morality (*unartig*, Luther). Several old commentators refer the word to *wandering* Jews, who had no fixed place of abode, but went about stirring up tumults against St. Paul and the Gospel. (Cf. "the vagabond Jews," Acts xix. 13.) But the usage of the LXX and of later Greek alike points to an *ethical* significance in the word—to sinfulness, under the aspect of *vanity* and *absurdity*. (οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα, those habitually doing sinful actions." Polycarp. ad Philipp. v.). See note at end of chapter.

**3.** *and shall* **guard you** *from the* **Evil One.**] (ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.) As far as the sense goes, *evil* may be taken either as (1) neuter, or (2) masculine. It may be understood (1) of evil looked upon in its entireness, as one collected mass; or (2) as exhibited in a personal being, whether (a) the Lawless One of 2 Thess. ii. 8, or, (b) much more probably, Satan. It has been said that "while the vision of Antichrist may be again for a moment rising before his eyes, it is simpler to take the words as a neuter." (Prof. Jowett). But it is thoroughly Pauline and Scriptural to rise from "evil *men*" (ver. 2) to "the *Evil One*" (ὁ πόνηρος); and "the Evil One" is never predicated of Antichrist, but is the term. tech. for Satan. "The world lieth wholly in the sphere of the Evil One." There may very probably be a reference to the petition in the Lord's Prayer. St. Matt. vi. 13. Cf. 1 St. John v. 18, 19.

**4.** *we have confidence in the Lord touching you.*] Christ was, so to say, the sphere in which it was felt; the Apostle felt confident as if in union with Christ, but, humanly speaking, his confidence was reposed and leant upon the Thessalonians.

**5.** But **may the Lord** *direct your hearts.*] Another instance of prayer to *Christ*. The occurrence of the word "Christ" at the close of the verse, has led Basil ('De Spir. Sanct.' 21), and other Greek commentators to suppose that the *Holy Spirit* may here be invoked as "the Lord" (So Bp. Wordsworth). The analogy of 2 Cor. iii. 18 is, however, doubtful (see Meyer, *in loc.*). For κατευθύναι, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 11.

*into the love of God and into the* **patience of Christ.**] Not "love toward God, patience for Christ's sake" (Beng.); but rather, "endurance of the cross of Christ, patiently borne after the example and in the strength of Christ" (Vorstius); "that we may suffer, as He suffered" (Chrysost.)

**6.** *we command you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves.*] "Not we say this, but Christ—such is the meaning of 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ'" (Chrysost.) This passage is important as bearing upon Apostolical authority. "That authority," it has been said, "was of a mixed kind, partly official, partly moral, yet also claimed by him as a *right*" (Prof. Jowett). But, surely, an authority claimed as a *right* may, indeed, be reinforced by moral considerations, but is eventually *official*. "The only method of enforcing it was by *excommunication*, the effect of which, in any state where ecclesiastics had not also a share in secular power, must have been dependent upon feeling and opinion." (Prof. Jowett). But it should be remembered, that if St. Paul be a true and sober-minded witness, there was something

Digitized by Google

Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.

7 For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you;

8 Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you:

9 Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us.

10 For even when we were with

---

beyond this. The being sent out from the shelter of the Church into the desert of the world was not only mental horror and darkness, an inward remorse and hopelessness; it was something more, apparently visible and palpable, possibly branding and seizure of the very *flesh* by him into whose realm and power the transgressor passed for the time being, yet not without hope of restoration upon penitence (1 Cor. v. 3, 4, 5; 1 Tim. i. 20). Our estimate of the effect of excommunication, as purely subjective or objective in its results, depends, in the last analysis, upon our estimate of the credibility of St. Paul. "Nor," it is said, "must we be misled by the word excommunication to suppose that, in these times, the thing existed in any definite form." But a passage cited above (1 Cor. v. 5) would lead to an opposite conclusion. Besides, if the thing existed at all, it *must* have existed in a "definite form." To exclude a man from any society, and much more from a religious society, is an extreme act, which could only have been performed under defined and understood conditions. Any society acting otherwise would be a prey to caprice, and rent asunder by intestine dissensions. It would bear within itself the germs of anarchy and dissolution. The same interesting writer again remarks that "there is no trace of exclusion from the Lord's Supper being the *mode* of exclusion from the Church. The object was purely a moral one, and the form of withdrawal different in different cases." "*Exclusion* from the Lord's Supper" could not be the *mode* of excluding from the Church in any case; it was the *result* of exclusion from the Church. But it was the most palpable form which the exclusion necessarily took. It has also been hinted that no amount of dogmatic heresy—not even the assertion that "the Resurrection was clearly past"—brought with it exclusion from the Church. But for the blasphemy of Hymenæus (which was evidently *that*), and his excommunication, see 1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18. For early opinions as to the bearing of the passage upon excommunication, see the large collection of quotations in Estius.

*that ye withdraw yourselves*] (στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ.) Στέλλομαι (Midd.) with ἀπό, means "to abstain from habitual conversation with," "to keep at a distance from," "to treat with studied distance and coldness," "to be shy of" (Keble, 'Stud. Sacra') "s'éloigner." [It is said that it is peculiarly used of those on a voyage by sea, "to give a wide berth to." See Bengel.] Chrysost. points to the much stronger and more indignant tone of St. Paul here than in 1 Thess. iv. 11.

*disorderly.*] See supra on Coloss. ii. 5. Erasmus points out the nature of the metaphor, "from *military* usage, where it is not allowable to break and leave the ranks."

*not after the tradition.*] The whole course and institution of the Christian life, which St. Paul had delivered to them (Mede). Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 15; *infra*, v. 10.

7, 8.] On St. Paul's trade and work, see sup. 1 Thess. ii. 9, and Acts xx. 34, 35.

*yourselves know how.*] It is better to teach by one's life than by one's sermons.

8. *for nought.*] (δωρεάν.) *Gratis*, i. e. *gratis* from a low, material point of view. Assuredly, the missionary or pastor does not get his bread without giving return, even when he pays no money for it. Cf. St. Luke x. 7; St. Matt. x. 10.

*but wrought.*] "But (sc. we *eat it*) with toil and travail, working night and day."

9. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 4. On "an ensample" (τύπον), see *supra* on 1 Thess. i. 7.

10. *this we commanded you.*] The A. V. well marks the emphatic position of the pronoun *this* in the original.

*if any would not work, neither should he eat.*] This was a favourite proverb in the Jewish schools (see quotations from *Beresith Rabba* and Ohel Moed, e. gr.—"whoever doth not work, doth not eat,"—in Hammond in loc.). Another good saying was, "Let not him, who would not labour before the Sabbath, eat on the Sabbath" (*In lib. Zenon.*). "It is St. Paul's order, nay, the ordinance of the Holy Ghost—and we should all put to our helping hands to see it kept—*he that will not labour, let him not eat*. Relieve him not. But hath not Christ required us to feed the hungry? 'Honour widows,' but 'those that are widows indeed'; so relieve the *poor*,

you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat.

11 For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies.

12 Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread.

13 But ye, brethren, ‖be not weary in well doing.

14 And if any man obey not our word ‖by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.

15 Yet count *him* not as an enemy, but admonish *him* as a brother.

16 Now the Lord of peace himself give you peace always by all means. The Lord *be* with you all.

‖ Or, *faint not.*

‖ Or, *signify that man by an epistle.*

---

but those that are *poor indeed.*" (Bp. Sanderson's Sermons, pp. 104, 214.)

11. *working not at all, but are busybodies.*] (*μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους.*) "Busy only with what is not their own business" (Prof. Jowett); "working at no business, but being busybodies" (Bp. Ellicott). Gregory Naz. had this text in his memory when he cried—"I had rather be unduly idle than a busybody"—(*ἀργὸς εἶναι μᾶλλον τοῦ δέοντος ἢ περιέργος δέχομαι* —Orat. xxvi.). The *περί* in *περιεργ.* gives it a bad sense, because that which *encircles* anything does not belong to the thing itself, but lies *outside* and *beyond* it: the thought in *περί* is first *circum*, then *ultra*; perhaps also an idea of exceeding proper limits, or going round and round in a circle. "Neglecting their proper work (ver. 2, of getting honest, unbegged bread) and occupying themselves, with a mean and mischievous sedulity, in things which lie outside their own proper sphere" (cf. Latin "malè seduli," and the French "*chevalier d'industrie*"). On the way in which the features of the national characteristics of those whom he addresses are mirrored in St. Paul's Epistles, see the interesting remarks of St. Hieron. in Galat. iii. 1, and the Introduction to the First Epistle.

12. *exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ.*] Many good MSS have here *ἐν*, "*in* our Lord Jesus Christ." Both are well attested, both thoroughly Pauline. (For "in" cf. 1 Thess. iv. 1; for "by" cf 1 Thess. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 1; xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1.) The "by" is probably to be preferred, as more usual with St. Paul in the solemn attestation of hortatory passages. Chrysost. notes the softening tone of the Apostle here.

*their own bread.*] *Their own* is very emphatic, "*not* other people's." The "cibus alienus" of Latin comedy, the *ἀλλοτρία μάζα* of Greek, is one of the most degrading features of the parasite's idle life. (Vorstius). "As if it were not *their own* bread, if not gotten with the work of their own hands, and in the sweat of their own brow." (Bishop Sanderson's Sermons, p. 208.)

13. Bishop Ellicott well translates—"lose **not heart** in well doing."

14. *If any man obey not our word by this epistle.*] The A. V. probably gives the best connection of the words. Two other modifications have been proposed: (1) "If any man obey not our word—by the means of the Epistle, set a brand upon him," as Leo XIII. at the commencement of his pontificate upon the beggars of Rome. This is probably far-fetched. But (2) another interpretation ("If any man obey not—by your letter to me brand him, mark him out for the purpose of his not being permitted to keep company with you") is still more so.

15. **And** *yet*] (*καὶ μή*) as often in St. John for *καὶ ὁμῶς* (1 St. John i. 6, St. John's Gospel i. 5, 10, iii. 11, 32, v. 40, vi. 58, 70• vii. 19, 22, 28, viii. 49, 55, ix. 30, 34, xi. 8, xiv. 9; Apoc. iii. 1: cf. Matt. iii. 14, vi. 26). It connects rhetorically a statement or statements, which might seem inconsistent with what goes before, and is equivalent to *et tamen.* It is found in St. Paul's Epistles in 1 Cor. v. 2, 10; 2 Cor. vi. 9; Heb. iii. 9.

*count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.*] Such admonitions were used among the Rabbis to one not formally excommunicated, nor excluded from the fold. The circumstances are different from the complete estrangement spoken of in St. Matt. xviii. 17. It has been well said that "excommunication is not like poison given to an enemy for destruction, but like medicine administered to a brother for restoration;" and that "the fact of a man's having been a brother should work in our hearts a memory of the old fraternity." (Grotius.)

16. *Now He the Lord of* **the Peace** *give you* **His** *peace*] a reference to the peace which Christ promised. (St. John xiv. 27.) Again the majestic *αὐτός*—again a prayer to *Christ.*

*give you peace always by all means.*] So

Digitized by Google

17 The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write.

18 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you all. Amen.

---

A. V. Many read "*everywhere*." Are we to adopt (1) the former (ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ)—so Tisch.; or (2) the latter? (ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ)? For (1) are A, B, ℵ; for (2) D, F, G—so Lachm., Prof. Jowett, Bishop Ellicott. (1) is strong in *antiquity*, in *external authority*, in *sense*. Peace from God is prayed for them, "omnino omni modo," "at every time, and in every kind of it;" *internally*, peace in their own souls, peace in freedom from schism and dissension among themselves; *externally*, peace from persecution and the strife of tongues. Probably some thought "by all means," "in every manner," somewhat obscure; they scarcely saw whether it referred to the way in which peace was prayed from God, or to the different forms and aspects of peace; (2) occurs with obvious meaning in 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8. But would it have much significance here? The Thessalonians needed peace, no doubt, in their own Church, and with their fellow-countrymen, scarcely "*everywhere*." Chrysostom probably read τόπῳ, for he explains—"The Apostle wishes them to be at peace everywhere, for everywhere peace is good." Yet, on the whole, the first reading seems preferable (cf. for expression 2 Thess. ii. 3; Philipp. i. 18, the last without ἐν) peace, in every conceivable form and mode, outward and inward.

*The Lord be with you all.*] The old liturgical form, Latin and Greek—ὁ κύριος μεθ' ὑμῶν—*Dominus vobiscum*—which took the place of Numbers vi. 24 in the old rite. It most probably refers to the great promise, ("I am with you alway," St. Matt. xxviii. 20), and implies, "may that promise be fulfilled!"

**17.** *The salutation* **by the hand of me Paul.**] The words from ὁ ἀσπασμὸς were written with his own hand.

*which.*] (ὅ.) The neuter of *generality*, not referring so much to "salutation" (which is masculine) as to the *fact* of a salutation in his writing being "a sign" in every epistle. To avoid fraud, which had large facilities in the epistolography of his day, St. Paul was used to send round a specimen of his handwriting, which was easily recognised (1 Cor. xvi. 21, Coloss. iv. 18); probably the writing was so peculiar as to be a safeguard against forgery. (See Renan, 'St. Paul,' p. 233.)

*in every epistle.*] It is a precarious inference that St. Paul had *then* written many epistles. He may, at least, be giving a rule for the future.

*So I write.*] The expression seems to meet any doubt which might arise in their minds. It may suggest a security against the possibility of forgery. This would coincide with the meaning assigned by some to 2 Thess. ii. 2.

**18.** With some slight variations in form, the "Grace" closes all the Pauline Epistles (and that to the *Hebrews*), and is peculiar to them. "Such a preacher of Divine Grace was Paul!" (Estius).

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 2, 6, 11.

**2.** In the LXX ἄτοπος appears as the translation of אָוֶן (*vanity* in thought, *falsehood* in heart, *wickedness* in action), Job iv. 8; xi. 11; xxx. 6; Prov. xxx. 20; in N. T. cf. St. Luke xxiii. 41; Acts xxv. 5 (Lachmann's text). In Acts xxviii. 6 it has a different sense—"out of the way," "inconvenient," "noxious," see Grimm, 'Clav. N. T.' Bretschn. quotes some passages from classical Greek, especially the ἄτοπον πνεῦμα "strange noxious smell" of the plague (Thucyd. ii. 49).

**6.** The Text. Rec. (παρέλαβε) is quite without uncial authority, and obviously accommodated to the preceding singular substantive, "every brother." Copyists fell into the mistake which Wolf made, who argues that "if the Apostle had referred to more than the brother walking disorderly, he must have written παρελάβετε, and this has some good authority (B, F, G)." But the third person plural has (1) more authority, especially Greek Fathers; (2) it is recommended by the very difference which Wolf has stated. "Every brother" has a collective force, which passes into παρέλαβον, and we should translate, "which **they** received of us."

**11.** The word is used by Josephus (περιεργαζόμενος τὰ θεῖα, 'Antiqq.' xii. 2, 13) and in the 'Testam. xii. Patriarch,' as signifying curious, unprofitable investigation opposed to simple obedience (see in Bretschn. s. v.). Quintilian quotes a description of Mallius Sura's restless and aimless motion in speaking and society, "non *agere* dixit, sed *satagere*" [*agit*, qui suo officio, *satagit*, qui vehementer sed frustra movetur.—Erasmus]. σωφροσύνη is described by Plato as τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πράττειν. (Professor Jowett, after à Laipde in loc.)

Digitized by Google

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on 2 Thess I. 9.

**such as shall suffer as penalty** *everlasting destruction*] (δίκην τίσουσιν ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον). The first occurrence chronologically of the word αἰώνιος in the Epistles of St. Paul appears to be the proper place for an examination of its meaning.[1]

(1) The *etymology* of the word αἰών perhaps throws some light upon the question. Aristotle saw that αἰών was in some way connected with ἀεί, and supposed that the connection was that of direct *derivation*. This is, at least, an indication of the meaning which αἰών had for him (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι εἰληφὼς τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν. 'De Cælo,' i. 9). In Professor Max Müller's opinion, "*Aevum* is from the same root as αἰών and the Sanskrit *âyus*; the root is *i*, and means 'to go.' 'Ἀεί, too, comes from the same source." (Quoted by Rev. J. Riddell, Note A on Dr. Pusey's sermon, 'Everlasting Punishment,' p. 32. The curiously analogous derivation of the Hebrew עַד will be seen below.) (2) The meaning of the word αἰών in classical Greek, especially as used by Aristotle, and in proportion as speculation advanced in definiteness, is unlimited prospective duration, eternity at least *à parte post*. Aristotle's language is very remarkable. "There is neither place, nor space, nor time, external to the heaven; whence the things there being unchangeable, and having the best and most self-sufficing existence without passion, fulfil in their course the whole eternity (διατελεῖ τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα). And in fact this name was divinely uttered by them of old time. For the sum total (τέλος) which comprises the time of the life of each, out of which nothing can be conceived according to the regular order of nature, is called the αἰών of each thing. And analogously, the sum total also of the entire heaven, and the sum total comprising all time and infinitude, is absolutely eternity (αἰών), a name derived from ever-existing." ('De Cælo,' i. 9; see Mr. Riddell's note *ut supra*, pp. 32–35, who also shews that in Plato, especially 'Legg.,' 904 A, αἰώνιος is used "unequivocally and intentionally of retrospective and prospective eternity.") A reference to Timæus (x. 37. e) will show that he distinguishes αἰών as "abiding," from χρόνος as its "mutable image," very much in the spirit of St. Augustine. ('Confess.' xi. 11–13.) (3) For Hebrew and LXX.—Man everywhere struggles with insuperable difficulties in finding words to enunciate his conception of eternity. This is, indeed, from the necessary conditions of thought, an effort to express that which is inexpressible. Contradictory lines are thus inwoven into the very texture of language. So it was certainly with the Hebrews. Four words are chiefly employed in Hebrew for eternity. (a) Eternity is looked upon, in St. Augustine's way, as "semper stans," and therefore as something in which we may *trust*. The word נצח, *confidence*, also means *eternity*, as we may confide in those things which endure. (b) A second term (קדם) denotes *locally* "what is before," "the East;" hence *temporally*, "aforetime," *indefinite antiquity*. In Micah v. 2, it answers in thought-rhyme to "the eternal days" (ימי עולם, ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος, LXX. and is translated by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. In Psalm lv. [liv.] 20 [19], God's eternity is spoken of as "His being enthroned of old" (קדם), translated πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων by the LXX. (No less than *twenty* different Greek words are employed to render it by the LXX. See Fuerst. 'Concord.' p. 972.) (c) The term most frequently used, however, to designate eternity is עולם. The word is derived from עלם, to hide or veil, and denotes that whose extremes are unknown and undefinable as regards the past or future. (d) St. Augustine has analysed the ideas of Time and Eternity with an acuteness and profundity which anticipate Kant. He shows that "nothing, properly speaking, *passes* in eternity, but that it is present wholly; that God's years neither come nor go, but all His years, as it were, stand simultaneously." "Anni tui omnes simul stant." ('Confess., lib. xi. 11–13; cf. 'De Civ. D.' x. 12.) But, do what we will, the idea of lapse and motion clings to our conception of eternity as time infinitely prolonged. This conception of eternity as time prolonged is represented by עַד (from עדה, to go forward.—Gesen.).[1] These four words—implying eternity as *infinite prolongation*, perfect *stability*, *antiquity* and *undefinability*[2]—are alike rendered occa-

[1] See Dean Mansel's note on St. Matt. xviii. 9 (vol. i. 93), and Canon Cook on St. Mark ix. 43. (Ibid. 259.)

[1] Of these words עד gives eternity *à parte post*, קדם eternity *à parte ante*, עולם, the *indefinite* expanded into the Infinite. The richness of Hebrew as regards this great conception is very significant in contrast with the poverty of Greek. The Hebrew mind arrived at it in four different ways, while *one* was sufficient for the Greek.

[2] The inspired writers struggle to find an expression in other forms also. Very simply and grandly does the writer of perhaps the noblest, poetically, of all the Psalms exclaim—

"Established is Thy Throne *from then*,
From everlasting Thou."—(Ps. xciii. 2.)

"From then" (מאז). "This expression is

sionally by *αἰών*, *αἰώνιος*, *κ. τ. λ.*, in the LXX.[1] (cf. for the first word *κατοικῶν τὸν αἰῶνα*, Isaiah lvii. 15; for the second *ἕως αἰῶνος*, Psalm xlix. 20 [xlviii. 18]; for the third, Psalm liv. [lv.] 19 [20]; for the fourth, *passim*—frequently of the Absolute Eternity of God, Ps. lxxvii. [lxxvi.] 5; xc. [lxxxix.] 2). *One* of the Hebrew words translated by *αἰών*, *αἰώνιος* (עולם) is, indeed, occasionally used of *temporary duration*—yet even in this modification prospectively of an unbroken continuity, co-extensive with the existence of that of which it is spoken. So *αἰώνιος* is predicated of a 'covenant' or 'statute' conterminous with the existence of the dispensation to which it belonged, of a servitude final so far as the earthly life of the slave is concerned. (Gen. xvii. 7, 13; Exod. xii. 14, 17; Levit. xvi. 29. Dr. Pusey, 'Everlasting Punishment,' p. 22.)

From the Hebrew and the LXX. we turn to the N. T. The word *αἰώνιος* occurs seventy-two times. The passages may be thus divided:—

Eternal—

| | |
|---|---|
| Life | 44 |
| Glory | 3 |
| Fire, judgment, destruction | 6 |
| Gospel | 1 |
| Covenant | 1 |
| Things unseen | 1 |
| New and abiding relation of Onesimus | 1 |
| Spirit | 1 |
| God | 1 |
| Consolation | 1 |
| Our inheritance | 2 |
| Home in the heavens | 1 |
| Christ's kingdom | 1 |
| Redemption | 1 |
| Salvation | 1 |
| Purpose | 1 |
| Sin, fixed and stereotyped in the soul[1] | 1 |
| Times[2] | 3 |
| Doxology ("To whom be power everlasting," 1 Tim. vi. 16) | 1 |

It has been well said lately that the word *æonian* "no more denotes *age-long*, i.e., 'lasting for an age, and then ending with the end of the age,' than *æternus* means ending with the *ætas*; but means *ages-long*, i. e., going on during the *æternitas à parte post*—that is, from the moment (within the period since Time began) at which that to which the epithet is applied commenced, and onward without end."[3] ('Church Quarterly Review,' Oct., 1880, p. 216.)

Thus the etymology of the word; the Hebrew term as rendered by the LXX.; and the subject to which it is applied admittedly in forty-four passages of the N. T.[4]—render it in the highest degree probable that the phrase "eternal ruin" or "destruction" means a "destruction" prospectively *final—everlasting* in the sense in which its subjects are everlasting.

---

perhaps, most *exempt from the idea of time*, i. e., look back as far as you will; go back and back and back beyond all those æons of which men speak; then, too, and 'from then,' was God." (Dr. Pusey, 'What is of Faith,' &c., p. 40.) Note also the same word in Isaiah xlv. 21, answering in thought-rhyme to the previous מקדם.

[1] The word עולם, עולמים, is always rendered by *αἰών*, *αἰώνιος*, *δι' αἰῶνος*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, *οἱ αἰῶνες*, except in some passages where we have *ἀένναος* and *διαπαντός*. It occurs, in different forms, 424 times in the Old Test. See Fuerst. 'Concord.,' pp. 830–832.

[1] Reading *ἁμαρτήματος* in St. Mark iii. 29.

[2] Twice of God's præ-æonian design (*πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, 2 Tim. i. 9; Titus i. 2 'eternal time before') in the eternity *à parte ante*. "The paraphrase 'before the world began,' although inadequate, is so far correct—'before eternal times.'" (Dr. Pusey, 'What is of Faith as to everlasting Punishment?' p. 43.) The third passage (*μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου*) is in Rom. xvi. 25. It is very noteworthy that the next verse (ver. 26) contains the only passage in the N. T. in which God is styled *αἰώνιος*.

[3] If the reference be to the well-known Jewish distinction between the two great æons—the *ὁ νῦν αἰών· ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* (עולם הזה) and the *αἰὼν ὁ μέλλον, ἐκεῖνος, ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (עולם הבא) —*αἰώνιος* would mean lasting during the future æon which has no end.

Eternal *life*."

Digitized by Google

# TIMOTHY AND TITUS,

## THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

THE two Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy with the Epistle to Titus form a clearly distinct group in the Apostolic writings. They have been designated *The Pastoral Epistles;* and though the expression, like that of *The Synoptic Gospels*, has the disadvantage of attributing to them in too great a degree a general design, and of thus diverting attention from their individual peculiarities, it marks with correctness the most important element which they have in common. The First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus are, indeed, mainly concerned with instructions and exhortations to those disciples of the Apostle respecting their duties as overseers of the two Churches committed to their charge, and with advice and warning in view of the special dangers they would have to meet. But the Second Epistle to Timothy starts from more personal considerations, and is in a far greater degree occupied by them. The Apostle writes it while under imprisonment at Rome, and in expectation of imminent martyrdom. "I am now," he says, "ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith" (2 Tim. iv. 6, 7). In a tone of deep emotion, natural in such circumstances, St. Paul writes to Timothy, entreating him, if possible, to come to him soon; and occasion is taken to address to him some earnest exhortations that he should be stedfast in the faith, and fulfil his course like the Apostle himself. But the duties which Timothy has to discharge in this course are those of a chief pastor; the Apostle is thus led to direct his advice in great measure to these special duties; and so far the Epistle resembles the other two.

It should, indeed, be borne in mind, since the fact has considerable weight in estimating some of the peculiarities of these Epistles, that they are personal as well as pastoral, differing in this respect from all the other Epistles of St. Paul except the brief one addressed to Philemon on a special occasion. But so far as they are concerned with the general interests of the Church, it is with the duties of pastors that they deal; and it is impossible to overrate their importance in this respect. The second Epistle to Timothy, indeed, must be regarded, as we shall see, as the last known writing of St. Paul before his martyrdom, and in that regard alone possesses an intense and unique interest. But for the general guidance of the Church there is something still more precious in instructions prompted by the matured wisdom of the Apostle, and addressed to his most trusted followers, respecting the manner in which they should "behave themselves," as pastors, "in the house of God" (1 Tim. iii. 15). It would, indeed, have been strange and unfortunate if we had been left without some such guidance. The other Epistles afford us all needful instruction respecting the great dogmatic truths of Christianity, and the chief points of Christian morals. But respecting the practical organisation and govern-

Digitized by Google

ment of the Church, they furnish only incidental hints. The deficiency is supplied by these three Epistles. They were written, as will be shown, near the close of the Apostle's career, when it was becoming necessary for him to provide for the due government, after he should have passed away, of the Churches he had founded. Brief as they are, they afford a clear insight into the principles by which he was guided, and they give advice which in all ages of the Church has been accepted as the Apostolic standard of pastoral duty.

The point which claims our first attention is the general and unhesitating acceptance of these Epistles by the Church, from the age of the Apostolic Fathers. In the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome, there are several expressions which it is natural to regard as at least allusions to the language of these Epistles, if not as actual quotations from them. Thus in Ch. 2 St. Clement says, "ye repented not of any well doing, but were *ready unto every good work*"—an expression which occurs in Tit. iii. 1. In Ch. 7 of St. Clement, the words "let us see what is good and what is pleasant and what is acceptable in the sight of him that made us" recall 1 Tim. v. 4. So the expression (Ch. xxix. 1), "Let us therefore approach him in holiness of soul, lifting up pure and undefiled hands unto him," recalls 1 Tim. ii. 8. A similar allusion perhaps is in the phrase "King of the ages" (Ch. lxi.), of which the only instance in the New Testament (a various reading in Rev. xv. 3 excepted), is in 1 Tim. i. 17, though it also occurs in the LXX. (Tobit xiii. 6, 10.) It is observed by M. Renan[1] that St. Clement's use of the word ἀνάλυσις in the sense of death seems to be an allusion to 2 Tim. iv. 6. He thinks the Epistles forged, but quotes this phrase in support of a suggestion that the forger had in his hands some authentic letters of St. Paul. He admits that there are other resemblances of expression between the Epistle of St. Clement and our three, but he accounts for them on the supposition that the two authors borrowed from the same source—the favourite language of the Church of Rome.

[1] *L'Église chrétienne*, *note*, pp. 95–96, ed. 1879.

These allusions deserve the more attention because St. Clement as a rule makes no formal quotation from the Books of the New Testament, and also on account of the personal character of the Epistles. It would be only natural that letters addressed, with a special and personal object, to two disciples of St. Paul should retain their more private character for some time, and should at any rate be longer in assuming the generally authoritative position of more public documents. It is striking, indeed, that one of the earliest and most distinct references we have to them is in the letter of an Apostolic Father, St. Polycarp, who was a Bishop of a Church contiguous to that of Ephesus, over which Timothy presided. In St. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians the allusions, certain or probable, to the Pastoral Epistles are more numerous than to any other Pauline writings, and there is one so unmistakable as to be acknowledged by even the most sceptical critics.[1] In the 4th chapter of that Epistle he says, "But the love of money is the beginning of all evils. Knowing therefore that we brought nothing into the world, and that neither can we carry anything out, let us arm ourselves with the arms of righteousness"—a distinct echo of 1 Tim. vi. 10, 7. The objections raised against the authenticity of St. Polycarp's letter are justly dismissed by Zahn[2] as too unreasonable to be discussed, in the face of the testimony borne to it by St. Polycarp's own disciple, St. Irenæus. It is, moreover, observed by a hostile critic[3] that the Epistle of Ignatius to St. Polycarp has the most striking points of connexion with the Second Epistle to Timothy. Passing to the writers immediately subsequent to the Apostolic age, we find further allusions. Such is Eusebius's quotation from Justin Martyr (Hist. Eccl. iii. 26) of the phrase, "the great mystery of godliness." The phrase, moreover, "knowledge falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi. 20) occurs in an abstract given by Eusebius, iii. 32, of a passage

[1] Cf. Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.* vol. ii. 159–60.

[2] 'Patr. Apostolic.' *Fascic.* ii. *Proleg.* p. xlvi.

[3] Pfleiderer, in *Protestanten-Bibel*, p. 836, ed. 1872.

Digitized by Google

of Hegesippus. Many writers, including Baur, are of opinion that Eusebius found this phrase in Hegesippus; and Eusebius certainly writes as if, without formal quotation, he desired to reproduce the words of Hegesippus. But the point, though interesting, admits of dispute, and need not be pressed. There is a clear quotation by Theophilus of Antioch (ad. Autol. iii. 14), where he says that the divine word (ὁ θεῖος λόγος) bids us pray for rulers and authorities, that we may live a quiet and peaceable life. But the next authority to be quoted may well be deemed, on this, as on so many other of the cardinal questions of early church history, to be decisive. St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, quotes the three Epistles as the undisputed works of St. Paul. He says in one place that Linus is mentioned by Paul "in the letters to Timothy"—thus attesting both Epistles to Timothy (adv. Hær. III. 3, § 3); and he quotes from the Epistle to Titus, "Paul said: A man that is an heretic . . . . reject" (ib. § 4). Here again we have the testimony of a man who was brought up under Polycarp, in the neighbourhood of the church to whose bishop these letters were addressed; and his testimony must be regarded as unanswerable evidence that they were accepted as St. Paul's in the very communities, and by the very men, whose knowledge of the circumstances to which they relate would be the most trustworthy. After this, the testimony of Ecclesiastical writers to them is frequent and unanimous. All three Epistles are included in the Muratorian Canon, and they are enumerated by Eusebius among the undisputed portions of the New Testament.

There is only one certain exception to this general acceptance. None of the three Epistles are admitted into Marcion's Canon, and it is doubtful whether the Epistles to Timothy were recognized by Tatian. St. Jerome says that although Tatian rejected some of St. Paul's Epistles, he considered the Epistle to Titus "*vel maxime apostoli pronunciandam, parvi pendens Marcionis et aliorum, qui cum eo in hac parte consentiunt, assertionem.*"[1] That among the Epistles thus rejected by Tatian were the two to Timothy, is probable enough; but his acceptance of the Epistle to Titus is the most certain, and the most important, point in his testimony. As Tatian died about 170 A.D., the fact of the Epistles being thus criticized by him would seem of itself evidence of their having acquired general authority before the middle of the second century. But these and other heretics, by whom, as Clement of Alexandria says, (Strom. ii. ch. 11) our Epistles were rejected in the second century, represented errors of the very same nature as those against which St. Paul's exhortations are directed, and their refusal to admit them stands on the same ground as their repudiation of the doctrine and authority of the Church. Marcion was restrained by no scruples from mutilating the Scriptures to bring them into accordance with his system[1] It was at one time imagined that there was some basis for the supposition of his having possessed an original gospel. Now, however, critics of all schools acknowledge that Marcion worked on St. Luke's Gospel, cutting out from it everything that discredited his system. We cannot suppose that so arbitrary a critic could have been debarred by any scruples from dealing in the same way with St. Paul's Epistles. There are passages in the Pastoral Epistles which, on his principles, he could not but cut out, and therefore his excisions prove nothing but his own views. If his silence could be taken as any indication that the Epistles were not known in his time, it might afford evidence which would deserve consideration. But in the face of the testimonies we have adduced, and of the fact that the Epistles were criticized by Tatian as authorities with which he had to deal, it is impossible to account in this way for Marcion's omission of them. It must therefore be ascribed to his peculiar views, and to the arbitrariness with which he cut and carved the Scriptures to his purpose. It ceases, at all events, to be impartial testimony.

The result is that we have a con-

[1] Hieron., *Comm. in Ep. ad Tit.*, prolog. opp. t. vii. p. 687, Vallarsi.

[1] Cf. Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, cc. ii. iii.

Digitized by Google

tinuous chain of testimony, from the time of St. Polycarp downwards, to the authenticity of these Epistles. During all the centuries which followed, they have commended themselves to the Christian conscience, and to the experience of Christian pastors—of bishops, priests and deacons—as exhibiting a truly Apostolic model of pastoral duties, and as in thorough harmony with the spirit of St. Paul. There is, perhaps, a peculiar weight to be attached in the present instance to this consent of testimony. Argumentative Epistles, dealing with high points of doctrine, are in some measure beyond the judgment of ordinary Christian experience. As concerned mainly with matters of revelation, they must in a great degree be accepted on authority. But the Christian Church at large is not incompetent to appreciate the wisdom, and the apostolic tone and temper, of practical directions on public worship, on the qualifications requisite for holding office, respecting the conduct of pastors towards various classes in the Christian community, towards men and women, old and young, and on the respective duties of the various relations of life. In all these points the Epistles have rooted themselves in the reverent affection of all the successive generations of Christians; and it ought to be acknowledged that an immense presumption is thus established in their favour. It is an offence to common sense, as well as to all feeling of propriety, for a sceptical writer[1] to speak of "the pointlessness" of the directions to Titus, as rendering them "all but worthless to an evangelist," to say that "most of the exhortations" in the Second Epistle to Timothy "are commonplace," or to describe "the pervading spirit" of all three Epistles as "flat, sober, sensible, without vigour, point, depth, or spiritual richness." No weight can be attached to the criticism of a man who can speak in this way of documents which have produced so deep an impression on the Christian mind. On points like these the historic and literary tact of M. Renan secures him from such gross errors, and his judgment is perhaps the best antidote to such language as Dr. Davidson's. In 'L'Église Chrétienne,' p. 95, he says, "*Quelques passages de ces trois épîtres sont d'ailleurs si beaux, qu'on peut se demander si le faussaire n'avait pas entre les mains quelques billets authentiques de Paul, qu'il aurait enchâssés dans sa composition apocryphe.*" We may take it for granted in discussing the authenticity of these Epistles, that we have to deal with documents intensely penetrated with the Apostolic spirit, and commending their authority to the conscience of the Church by their inherent force.

Nevertheless, from the commencement of the present century, they have been the object of a vehement and persistent assault by a succession of German critics, and their authenticity is still vehemently contested by that school of writers whose attacks on so many of the other books of the New Testament it has been necessary to meet in this Commentary. In this instance, however, as in all others, the controversy has been attended with the advantage of elucidating the circumstances in question, and of promoting a more vivid comprehension of the character and position of the three Epistles. They certainly present, not merely peculiar characteristics, but peculiar difficulties; and there are historical points connected with them which are not yet cleared up, and which, with our present information, will probably remain obscure. But enough may be placed beyond the reach of reasonable doubt to justify a sure conviction that we possess in these Epistles some of the last words of St. Paul, and to enable us to interpret them with sufficient clearness for all practical purposes.

The difficulties in question are threefold. It is, in the first place, extremely difficult, not to say impossible, to find a place within the history of St. Paul, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, for the incidents mentioned in the course of these Epistles. The question therefore arises whether we are justified in referring them to a period of his life subsequent to that narrated by St. Luke, and whether on that supposition their statements are

[1] Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.* (vol. ii. pp. 129, 136, 169).

Digitized by Google

harmonious and historically credible. In the next place they are marked by peculiarities of language and style, which they possess in common, but which distinguish them clearly from the other three groups of St. Paul's Epistles. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians, the four Epistles recognised as authentic even by Baur—to the Romans, to the Galatians, and the two to the Corinthians — and thirdly, the four Epistles of the Captivity—those to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, to the Philippians and to Philemon—each group has its characteristic tone of thought, and to some extent its characteristic turn of language; but the Pastoral Epistles stand apart from all three, new and striking words and phrases occurring in them. Lastly, all three Epistles contain denunciations of certain forms of false teaching; and it is alleged that the errors thus indicated are identical with some which appeared a generation or two after St. Paul, but had not been developed in his life-time. A similar objection is based on the indications afforded in the Epistles of the organisation of the Church at the date they were written—an organisation, it is alleged, which marks a stage of development subsequent to the time of St. Paul. In a word, it is argued that the historical, the literary, and the controversial characteristics of the Epistles are alike incompatible with what is known of St. Paul and his times.

Our answers to these objections will be of two kinds. In respect to the first two, we admit the facts, but we dispute the inferences drawn from them. In respect to the latter, we dispute the facts themselves.

It will be convenient to begin by reviewing the general course of the controversy. It was opened by an attack upon the First Epistle to Timothy. This was commenced by Schmidt in his Introduction, published in 1804; but its first forcible development was due to Schleiermacher, in a letter published in 1807 "on the genuineness of the so-called First Epistle to Timothy." He recognised the authenticity of the second Epistle, and of the Epistle to Titus, but maintained that the first Epistle was an imitation of them by a later hand. But from the similarity of the three Epistles, objections such as we have mentioned against the first were at once felt to tell with similar weight against the other two; and it was not long before Eichhorn and De Wette pushed Schleiermacher's arguments to their natural conclusion, and pronounced against all three. After this, for a time, rationalistic criticism wavered in its results, sometimes going back to Schleiermacher's position; and Credner, to mention the name of most eminence, elaborated an ingenious theory that the Epistle to Titus was genuine, but that the Epistles to Timothy had grown around brief letters of the Apostle much in the same way as the longer letters of St. Ignatius are supposed by many writers to have grown out of the short Syriac recension. Up to this time criticism had been purely negative. But at length, in 1835, Baur, with his characteristic audacity, reviving Eichhorn's view that the three Epistles must stand or fall together, fixed their supposed date definitely to the middle of the second century, on the ground that the errors combated in them are the fully developed heresies of Marcion. Since then, it cannot be said that any new element of material importance has been introduced into the controversy. Reuss, indeed, has of late, in his edition of the Scriptures with Introductions and Commentaries, admitted the Second Epistle to Timothy as unquestionably genuine, while, though with some hesitation, he rejects the First, as well as the Epistle to Titus. Bleek, also, like Schleiermacher, rejects only the 1st Epistle to Timothy. But practically it may be said to be one result of the long controversy that the three Epistles stand or fall together; and if Reuss's conclusion as to the second Epistle to Timothy, or Bleek's respecting this and the Epistle to Titus be accepted, few will follow them in their negative conclusions in rejecting the others.

It will be found an advantage to reverse the course which criticism has thus pursued, and to consider in the first instance the Second Epistle to Timothy. That Epistle, as Reuss has



Digitized by Google

forcibly urged,[1] is characterised by the strongest internal marks of genuineness. In every line it expresses the deepest feeling and most intense earnestness; and corresponds with the utmost vividness to the circumstances of which it speaks. It purports to be addressed by St. Paul, while in captivity and in imminent prospect of martyrdom, to a beloved disciple, whom he has entrusted with the charge of carrying on his own work. He recalls, as is natural to men in such solemn moments, reminiscences of the past—his early acquaintance with Timothy, and the character of Timothy's early training. He reminds him of the unfeigned faith which he learned from his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice, and which, as the Apostle is persuaded, still animates him. The letter proceeds to put him in remembrance to stir up the gift of God, which was given him by the imposition of the Apostle's hands; and bids him not be ashamed of the testimony with which he was entrusted, nor of the Apostle himself, then imprisoned for it. St. Paul then dwells briefly on the glorious character of the Gospel; and after a pathetic mention of the manner in which he had been deserted by some friends, but diligently sought out and refreshed by another, he passes on to exhort Timothy to be strong in the grace of Jesus Christ, to uphold the form of sound words which he had heard of St. Paul among many witnesses, and to follow the example which he had fully known in the Apostle's "doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, long-suffering, charity, patience, persecutions, afflictions." The tone of suffering which runs throughout the Epistle is particularly noticeable and touching, and it would seem as if, when bidding Timothy to endure hardness, as a good soldier of "Jesus Christ," the Apostle were speaking from the depths of his own bitter experience at that moment, and were pointing to the endurance he was himself called upon to display. The Epistle bespeaks a vivid and oppressive sense of the dangers, the hardships, the persecutions which St. Paul was then suffering himself, and which he foresaw in the immediate future for Timothy. "Yea," he exclaims, "and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." He looks forward, evidently, with some apprehension to the possibility of Timothy failing under this severe strain; and ends his exhortations by a solemn charge to him, "before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing and his kingdom. Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine. . . . Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an Evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." These reiterated, intense exhortations correspond with almost painful naturalness to the position of an Apostle like St. Paul addressing a disciple like Timothy, in view of approaching death, and of having to leave him behind in circumstances of such danger and difficulty. For himself, his work was done. He was ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand. He had fought the good fight; he had finished his course; he had kept the faith; and he looked forward to the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, would give him "at that day." Then he passes for a while to give a number of personal details, interspersed with expressions which reflect the sufferings and disappointments of his imprisonment; and he twice begs Timothy to come to him quickly. "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me." . . . "Do thy diligence to come before winter." There is one passing request which it may be confidently said that no forger would ever have dreamed of putting into a letter which he desired to palm off as written in the last hours of our Apostle. "The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." Alike in its general tone and in its details, the Epistle is one of those heartfelt natural utterances which bespeak their own genuineness.

[1] *Épîtres pauliniennes*, vol. ii., pp. 248–250. Paris, 1878.

Digitized by Google

Reuss says very well, in the passage above referred to, that "this Epistle, from one end to the other, in all its details and in numerous allusions, corresponds to the situation we have indicated. It may even be said that no other, among the Pauline Epistles, is comparable to it in this respect. The fact that the tone changes several times, according as the author is momentarily dominated by the idea of his approaching death, or as he disengages himself from this pre-occupation to think only of the cause he is defending—this fact is but one proof the more that we have here natural outpourings of the heart, which ought to evoke sympathy and to disarm criticism."

But still, with all this overwhelming presumption from internal evidence in its favour, the Epistle must be tested by the inquiry whether the circumstances it mentions are in harmony with the recognised facts of the history of St. Paul. Now it is written by St. Paul as a prisoner, and a prisoner at Rome (ch. i. 17), and the circumstances in question appear irreconcilable with the incidents of the Roman captivity recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the so-called Epistles of the Captivity. It is not, indeed, very easy to see why this difficulty should be seriously felt by critics who, in other connexions, disparage the historical trustworthiness of the Acts of the Apostles. But on the supposition of that trustworthiness, the difficulty is unquestionable. Thus in ch. iv. 20, St. Paul says "Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick;" and no natural interpretation can be put upon these words but that, in the course of the journey by which St. Paul reached Rome, he had passed from Miletus to Corinth, leaving Trophimus sick at the former place, and parting from Erastus at the latter. Now Trophimus was certainly at Jerusalem with St. Paul, and if, therefore, he was left behind it must have been in going from Jerusalem to Rome. But in St. Paul's journey to Rome narrated in the Acts, he sails from Cæsarea past Crete and Malta, far away from either Corinth or Miletus. The request, moreover, that Timothy would bring him the articles he had left behind at Troas, implies a recent visit there—a visit which would perfectly fall in with a journey from Miletus to Corinth, such as that implied in ch. iv. 20, taking Macedonia in the way; but which is out of all relation to the events which preceded St. Paul's first captivity in Rome. If, therefore, the incidents mentioned in this Epistle are to be satisfactorily accounted for, we must infer that St. Paul was released from the captivity at Rome of which the Acts of the Apostles speak, must have undertaken further travels, must afterwards have been a second time imprisoned, and in this second imprisonment have suffered his martyrdom. Is there any reason why we should hesitate to believe that this was the case?

So far from there being any such objection, we have independent evidence to the same effect. It was the general tradition of the Church in the first centuries that St. Paul was released from his first imprisonment, and made further missionary journeys. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. ii. 22) thus supplements the history of the Acts of the Apostles. He says that St. Paul, "after having defended himself, is said to have set forth again upon the ministry of preaching, and to have entered the same city a second time, and to have there ended his life by martyrdom." "Whilst then a prisoner," adds Eusebius, "he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which he both mentions his first defence and his impending death." In this reference to his "first defence," Eusebius follows what is no doubt an erroneous interpretation of the words 2 Tim. iv. 16: "At my first defence no man stood with me"—words which must be taken to refer (see note on the passage) not to his previous imprisonment, but to his first appearance before the Roman Court, in the imprisonment from which the Epistle was written. But there remains the fact that it was said—λόγος ἔχει,—it was the current report in the time of Eusebius, that St. Luke's narrative in the Acts of the Apostles did not mark the close of St. Paul's life; but that he took other journeys, and was again imprisoned.



Digitized by Google

Of this current report we have two extant testimonies, one of which is perfectly explicit, the other carrying a high degree of probability. The latter is afforded by a passage in the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (ch. v.): "By reason of jealousy and strife, Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world, *and having reached the boundary of the West;* and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed from the world and went unto the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patient endurance." (*St. Clement of Rome, An Appendix*, Lightfoot, p. 348.) The phrase we have italicised, "the boundary of the West," τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως, is undoubtedly a difficult one; but Dr. Lightfoot in his note on the passage (*Epistle of Clement*, pp. 49–50) has shewn that its most natural interpretation is that it means "the western extremity of Spain, the pillars of Hercules." Bishop Pearson (*Minor Theol. Works*, i. p. 362) quotes in illustration a passage from Philostratus (v. 4), in which Gades is said to lie κατὰ τὸ τῆς Εὐρώπης τέρμα. Attempts have been made to explain it as meaning Rome; translating it "St. Paul's extreme limit towards the West," or "the sunset of his labours," or "the boundary between East and West," or "the goal or centre of the West," or "before the supreme power of the West." But all such interpretations, as Dr. Lightfoot observes, appear forced. St. Clement is writing at Rome, and as an inhabitant of Rome; and it is scarcely conceivable that he should speak of that city, which was the centre of East and West, as "the boundary of the West." The argument in Dr. Lightfoot's edition of St. Clement on this point seems conclusive; and he is supported by Gebhardt and Harnack in their recent valuable edition of the Apostolic Fathers, although, on other grounds, they consider the journey to Spain doubtful.

But the next testimony is open to no such question. The Muratorian fragment on the Canon, the date of which, according to the general consent of critics, is determined to be about A.D. 170, refers as to a well known fact to St. Paul's journey from the City of Rome to Spain. It speaks of St. Luke as having written the Acts of the Apostles "because the events related were enacted in his presence, as he evidently declares by putting aside the passion of Peter, and moreover the departure of Paul from the city when setting out for Spain."[1] Great stress may justly be laid on the independence of this evidence. It stands in no connexion, like the passage in Eusebius, with the Pastoral Epistles, and it is clear proof that a person well acquainted with Rome—since he mentions the recent publication there of the Pastor of Hermas—took for granted that St. Paul undertook a journey from that city to Spain; and no one will suppose that there is any room for such a journey within the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles. Now we know from the Epistle to the Romans (xv. 24, 28) that it was St. Paul's distinct intention to visit Spain. He speaks of it as a settled matter. "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you" . . . . "I will come by you into Spain." We have therefore an unquestionable and matured intention on the part of the Apostle, very early tradition that this intention was fulfilled, and the general belief of the Fathers that the opportunity for fulfilling it was afforded him by release from his first imprisonment.

To this it must be added that there is no tradition and no evidence to the contrary. After Eusebius we have testimonies to the same effect from Epiphanius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome and Theodoret, and they all write as if the second imprisonment

[1] We translate from Hilgenfeld's text given in his *Einleitung*, p. 43. The text is obscure; but there is no doubt of its speaking of Paul's journey to Spain as a fact equally well recognised with St. Peter's passion.

Digitized by Google

were generally believed. It would seem, in view of these considerations, that even if we did not possess the Second Epistle to Timothy, there would be a presumption, so strong as to be almost conclusive, that St. Paul was released from his first captivity and visited Spain. But it is further an uncontested fact that St. Paul suffered a martyr's death at Rome. Such being the case, it follows that the Second Epistle to Timothy, bearing witness to a second imprisonment, supplies the very link which is wanting to harmonise the facts and presumptions otherwise established.

It appears to us that these historical considerations alone, combined with the marks already noticed of the Epistle being a genuine Apostolic writing, are sufficient to remove all doubts respecting the authenticity of the second Epistle. But if anyone could entertain the supposition that some forger was ingenious enough to fit it, with consummate appearance of artlessness, into these scattered traditions, there remain other points in the Epistle which render such a notion inconceivable. We refer to the personal details mentioned. It has been forcibly observed[1] that there is no part of the New Testament so rich in such details. In the Second Epistle to Timothy no fewer than twenty-three members of the Apostolic Church are mentioned. "These, moreover, are neither exclusively names to be found elsewhere, in which case it might have been said that they had been derived from the genuine writings; nor all new names, in which case it might be said that the forger had guarded himself by avoiding the names of real persons, and only speaking of persons invented by himself;" but, just as might have been expected in a real letter, some ten persons are mentioned of whom we read in the other scanty records of the same time which have descended to us; while the others occur for the first time. In the case of the old names, new details are given, which could in no way have been expected. Thus we have in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 14), "Luke the beloved physician and Demas greet you;" in that to Philemon, "There salute thee . . . Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellowlabourers." Now note the treatment of these four names in the Second Epistle to Timothy. There we read, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world . . . Only Luke is with me." A forger must have had very extraordinary qualities to be able so to realise the personality of St. Paul's attendants as to give their history subsequent to the time covered by the received records, and to put a note of disgrace on one who, so far as the genuine Epistles went, had been honourably recognised as Paul's fellow-labourer. Lastly, of Aristarchus the Pastoral Epistles have not a word to say, though his name might have been expected to occur in that enumeration of his attendants which the Apostle makes in accounting for being left alone. The sufficient explanation may be that Aristarchus was dead; but if the Epistle were a forgery, how is it that a writer who can so boldly give the history of Paul's other attendants should shrink from saying anything about Aristarchus? We may also comment on the sentence, "Titus to Dalmatia." If, as would be supposed, the forger were the same man who wrote the other Epistles, would he not have been consistent and sent Titus to Crete? Of the new names, again, one is certainly the name of a real person, Linus, who, according to early tradition and the positive authority of Irenæus, was the first bishop of the Church of Rome. Yet it is to be noted that the Epistle must have been earlier than the origin of that tradition, for he is put in no prominent place, but is mentioned after Eubulus and Pudens, personages of whom we know nothing else. This mention of Linus, indeed, might of itself be deemed enough to show that the Epistle was written in St. Paul's lifetime, for his headship of the Roman Church can with great probability be traced to the time immediately after the death of the Apostle. One more personal reference seems worth notice—the mention twice over of the household of Onesiphorus. The controversial use which has been made of

[1] By Dr. Salmon, in the *Christian Observer* for 1877, p. 801.

Digitized by Google

this reference is well known (see note upon 2 Tim. i. 18). But from the salutation being made to the house of Onesiphorus, not to Onesiphorus himself, we may reasonably conclude that he was either dead, or at least known to the Apostle not to be with his household at the time. There is no difficulty about the matter if all be real history. But that a forger should have invented such a refinement, yet in no way have called attention to it, is quite incredible.

Indeed, the impress of genuineness in these personal references is so strong as to have compelled some of the most hostile critics to allow that the verses containing them are fragments of genuine letters from St. Paul. Thus Pfleiderer, in his introduction to the Pastoral Epistles in the *Protestanten-Bibel N. T.* (p. 837, first ed.) says that "the Second Epistle to Timothy contains at least two sections which have of late—and not without good reason—been recognized as fragments of genuine letters of St. Paul, namely the passages in ch. i. 15–18 and iv. 9–21. . . . The second section in particular, by its numerous personal notices, produces the impression of genuineness." But this is an admission that those very portions of the Epistles which are most capable of being put to a definite test come out of the trial satisfactorily; and the arbitrariness of refusing to allow this fact to afford any testimony to the genuineness of the other portions is patent. What would be said[1] if the case were the other way, and if those who contended for the genuineness of the Epistle as a whole were obliged to give up as spurious the verses containing personal details? That which would be said is what we have now a right to say to critics like Pfleiderer—that it is tantamount to a confession of defeat to surrender all that part of their case which admits of being tested, and to maintain that part only with respect to which prejudices and subjective fancies do not admit of being checked. It has been already mentioned that Renan finds in other passages, which are not thus marked by personal references, a beauty of thought and expression which bespeaks the hand of St. Paul. When hostile criticism of one school admits the genuineness of the personal passages, and hostile criticism of another school makes a similar admission respecting the didactic passages, we may safely conclude that the whole negative position is untenable.

In this connexion, moreover, one or two other striking points should be observed which recall the other Epistles of St. Paul. Dr. Salmon, for instance, in the paper we have already quoted, draws attention to the verse (2 Tim. i. 3) which forms the exordium of the second Epistle. St. Paul begins by thanking God for the unfeigned faith which is in Timothy, and tells him that without ceasing he has remembrance of him in his prayers night and day. Now of St. Paul's ten other letters eight commence with thanking God for what he has heard or knows of the religious progress of those whom he addresses. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is scarcely an exception, for that, too, begins with thanksgiving. The only clear exception is the Epistle to the Galatians, which is a letter of sharp reproof. None of the other New Testament Epistles resemble St. Paul's in this peculiarity. Of the eight letters which begin with thanksgiving for the progress of his converts in the faith, six go on to speak of his continual prayer for them. It is characteristic of St. Paul that, even when writing to Churches with which he had occasion to find fault, he begins by fixing his thoughts on what there was in those Churches deserving of praise, and by calling to mind his constant prayer on their behalf. Indeed, the resemblance of the opening of this Epistle with that to the Romans has been actually made a ground for attributing it to a deliberate imitator. But criticism which at one moment uses differences to prove that an Epistle is not St. Paul's, and at another uses resemblances to show that it was the work of an imitator, is too hard to please to be worth much consideration. Another very re-

[1] See again Dr. Salmon's article in the *Christian Observer*, already quoted (p. 802).

Digitized by Google

markable and very touching coincidence has been noticed in the Introduction, in this Commentary, to the Epistle to the Philippians. In that Epistle, written during his first captivity, St. Paul speaks of his desire to depart (εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι) (i. 23) of his conflict (ἀγὼν), (i. 30) of his willingness to be offered (σπένδομαι), (ii. 17), of his pressing on (iii. 14) in his contest for a prize. The same ideas recur to him after the lapse of several years, at the close of his second imprisonment, and are expressed in the same language. "I am now," he says to Timothy, "ready to be offered (σπένδομαι), and the time of my departure (ἀναλύσεως) is at hand. I have fought the good fight (ἀγῶνα); I have finished my course." The words and the thoughts are alike unique, and what could be more natural than their recurrence when a second imprisonment brought into immediate prospect the fate apprehended in the first?

Such are the reasons, positive and negative, which establish beyond any reasonable doubt the authenticity of the Second Epistle to Timothy. It may be regarded, with the utmost confidence, as the last recorded utterance of the Apostle Paul, revealing to us his position and his feelings in the final crisis of his life. Next to the Gospels, there is no part of the New Testament which possesses a deeper interest for Christian hearts. It is the seal to St. Paul's long ministry, and is the most solemn expression of his convictions.

But we must now pass to the other two Pastoral Epistles, and it will be seen that we have gained a point of view which removes at once a great part of the difficulties from which we started. There are not so many definite circumstances of time and place furnished in the First Epistle to Timothy; but though great ingenuity has been expended by Wieseler and others in the endeavour to bring them within the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, all such attempts are, to say the least, extremely forced. From ch. i. 3, "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine," &c., it appears that the Epistle is addressed to Timothy at Ephesus, and that St. Paul, on starting from that city on a journey to Macedonia, had left Timothy behind him in charge of the Church there. It appears, moreover, from ch. iii. 14, that St. Paul hoped soon to return himself, but thought it possible he might be detained some time. Now, in the Acts of the Apostles St. Paul is described as having been twice at Ephesus. But the first occasion was the brief visit (Acts xviii. 19) on his way from Corinth to Jerusalem, so that he did not then leave for Macedonia. The other occasion was when he stayed from two to three years at Ephesus. At the end of this time he did leave for Macedonia (Acts xx. 1). But he could not then have left Timothy behind, for he had sent him and Erastus on before into Macedonia (Acts xix. 22); and Timothy could not have returned before Paul's departure, for when the Apostle reached Macedonia and wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Timothy was with him. It has been suggested that during St. Paul's long stay at Ephesus he might have made a journey to Macedonia which St. Luke has not recorded. But it seems extremely improbable that St. Luke should have omitted to mention a journey which must have occupied so considerable a time during that memorable period of three years' work at Ephesus. From an expression, indeed, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (xii. 14), it has been supposed that St. Paul paid during this period a visit to Corinth which is not mentioned in the Acts. But even if this were certain, it would be no sufficient parallel to the present case. Although the Apostle speaks (1 Tim. ch. iii. 14) of hoping to come back soon (ταχίον), the whole tone of the instructions in the Epistle implies that he was placing in Timothy's hands a general responsibility for the Church at Ephesus; the reference to his intended return and possible delay is only to explain his giving these instructions by letter instead of by word of mouth; and it is scarcely conceivable that St. Paul should have written in such a tone during the temporary absence which the supposition in question implies.

Digitized by Google

Similar difficulties arise with respect to the Epistle to Titus if we attempt to place it within the period of the Acts. The circumstances it states are (ch. i. 5) that St. Paul had recently left Titus in Crete that he might "set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city"—or city by city. Again it has been supposed that, although St. Luke makes no mention of a journey to Crete, it may have occurred during St. Paul's stay at Ephesus. But the same general objections arising from St. Luke's omission to mention such a journey apply in this instance; and they are much enhanced by the circumstances presupposed in the Epistle. St. Paul must have been in Crete long enough to have evangelised several towns, and must have left behind him a Church in a somewhat advanced state of organisation. He could hardly have been absent from Ephesus long enough for this purpose. He proposes also to winter at Nicopolis, and desires Titus to come to him there. But again, as Lewin shews (ii. 291), his winters before his journey to Cæsarea are all accounted for elsewhere, unless we again suppose an inexplicably long absence from Ephesus in the course of his three years' stay there. For all these reasons it seems impracticable to find any room for these two Epistles in the life of St. Paul if his journeys came to an end with his first imprisonment.

But on the supposition, which has been shewn to be well-founded on other grounds, that the Apostle's journeys were not so concluded, we have a space of time amply sufficient for the incidents mentioned in the three Pastoral Epistles, and all chronological difficulty disappears. From the comparatively scanty notes of time, indeed, which they afford us, it is scarcely to be expected that we should be able to construct an indisputable scheme of the Apostle's journeys and of his life during the period to which they relate. It is sufficient for all the purposes of the argument that such a scheme should be capable of construction; and in point of fact various arrangements have been proposed, any one of which would meet the facts of the case. Two points, however, as it seems to us, may be fairly assumed. The one is that St. Paul's first visit after his release was to Spain. The Muratorian fragment speaks of his setting out from Rome to Spain (ex urbe proficiscentis), and it would obviously be more natural and convenient for him to fulfil his intention of making that visit to the West before returning again to the East. Secondly, his last journey before his second imprisonment appears, as we have shewn, to have been through Miletus, Troas and Corinth. He would seem, therefore, first to have gone to Spain, then to have returned to the East to visit the Asiatic churches, taking, perhaps, Crete in his way. He leaves Titus there, and goes on to Ephesus, and from thence, in an order which it may be difficult to ascertain precisely, takes the final journeys which are recorded in the 2nd Epistle to Timothy.

Now this assignment of the three Epistles to the same period, and this the last period of St. Paul's life, at once accounts for the peculiarities which are common to them, and upon which adverse criticism has been based. The mere fact, indeed, of a wide difference in phraseology from other known works of St. Paul would of itself be no material evidence against these Epistles having been written by him. The style and language of a great writer naturally change with his subject, and the more so in proportion to his greatness; and St. Paul is the last man to have been restricted in his style and mode of expression. The extraordinary versatility of his mind and of his whole nature—to the Jews becoming a Jew, to the Greeks a Greek, to the Romans a Roman, able to be all things to all men—is one of his most conspicuous characteristics. It is in every way to be expected that the letters of such a man would vary, both in their phraseology and in their mode of expression, with the subject he was treating, his time of life, and the persons whom he addressed. On the supposition we have been explaining, these reasons all apply emphatically to the present Epistles. They are separated by an interval of several years from the rest; they are written, as none of the others are, to

Digitized by Google

disciples who have long been the Apostle's intimate companions, and they treat of new topics and new circumstances. It has been shown, in fact, that there are as many ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in other Epistles as in these. Thus the First Epistle to Timothy contains eighty-one, the Second sixty-three, and that to Titus forty-four; while the Epistle to the Philippians contains fifty-four, that to the Galatians fifty-seven, and those to the Ephesians and Colossians together no fewer than a hundred and forty-three.[1]

Many such variations would, in the nature of things, be purely accidental. Thus some stress has been laid upon the fact that the Greek word used for the master of a slave is in the Pastoral Epistles δεσπότης, while in the other Epistles of St. Paul it is κύριος. But what argument would it be against the authenticity of a private letter that a man spoke in it of a slave and his owner, whereas in previous letters he had spoken of a slave and his master? As a matter of fact, however, δεσπότης, which is used in these Epistles, is the correct and usual phrase for a master of slaves. It would naturally be used by any one familiar with the customary language of that day; and if there be any question worth consideration on such a point, it is not why St. Paul should use δεσπότης, but why he should ever use κύριος elsewhere. The reason is perhaps discernible. In all cases where he calls the master of slaves κύριος, he is enforcing the duties of a Christian master by reminding him of his relation to his own Lord—whose gracious relation to his people is indicated by his being almost always described as their κύριος, not as their δεσπότης.

But a greater interest attaches to the character of some of these new expressions. In many instances they represent more than a merely varied vocabulary. They indicate the presence in the writer's mind of a new class of ideas. We find, for instance, several times the expression "This is a faithful saying"—twice (1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9), with the addition, "and worthy of all acceptation"—applied to striking Christian maxims. The word "*godliness*" or piety (εὐσέβεια) is frequently employed as though it were the customary expression for the character of Christian life (1 Tim. ii. 2; iii. 16; iv. 7, &c.); and it is similarly employed in the second Epistle of St. Peter (iii. 11): "what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and *godliness*." Another very characteristic expression is the phrase "sound doctrine," and similar applications of the word "sound" or wholesome; see 1 Tim. i. 10; vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13; iv. 3; Titus i. 9, 13, &c.; and akin to this is the more frequent use here than in other Epistles of the word (σώφρων), sober-minded. It is evident that Christian truth has assumed, as in the "faithful sayings," something of a fixed habitual form, and takes the mould of almost proverbial expressions. Christian doctrine is assuming the character of a definite rule of right judgment and wise action, and is present to men's minds as a fixed and recognized standard, applicable as a test of thought and practice. In addition to this, peculiar stress is laid upon the outward expression of religion in piety, reverence, and sobriety of conduct. The Gospel, in a word, is contemplated not only in its central truths and primary elements, but in its practical working as a wholesome, controlling and directing influence in all the details of life.

Now, what can be more natural than that this aspect of the Gospel should have become more prominent in the Apostle's mind as he contemplated, towards the close of his life, the Churches he had founded? It is the uniform characteristic of his other Epistles to commence with establishing some fundamental verities, and to conclude by an exhortation to a holy walk in the various relations of Christian life. In proportion as he had succeeded, in a Church like Ephesus, in securing the due recognition of those central truths, would they become, in the course of a few years, the received standard of truth, and

[1] Davidson (*Introd.* ii. p. 184) complains of this as a "mechanical objection." But he had just printed (p. 182) a page of isolated words as "ἅπαξ λεγόμενα," in support of his own contention. A mechanical objection is a valid answer to a mechanical argument.

Digitized by Google

his attention would be concentrated on their development in practice. A very few years might make a great difference in this respect. The Church, moreover, would increase in numbers, and in proportion to this development, the necessity of exercising a supervision over its members would increase. The opportunities for error in conduct would be multiplied, and fresh practical problems would be continually arising. If these Epistles had been written in the same period as the others, within the limits of the history narrated in the Acts, so considerable a transfer of the Apostle's attention from one class of dangers to another, and the introduction of expressions betokening a new aspect of the bearings of Christian truth, would be difficult of explanation. But when once it is recognized that they were written later, they reveal to us a development in the history of the Church which is at once very natural and very instructive.

When this peculiarity of the Epistles is understood, there seems to remain no question as to their harmony in other respects with the general tone of St. Paul's thought. On this point the testimony of Hilgenfeld, one of the acutest opponents of the authenticity of the Epistles at the present day, is specially deserving of attention.[1] St. Paul, he observes, describes himself as the former persecutor of Christians, who through God's mercy, has been made an example to all believers (1 Tim. i. 13–16), and it is with a natural reference to those who doubted his Apostolic authority, that he declares "Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an Apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not;) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity (1 Tim. ii. 7; cf. 2 Tim. i. 11.") He appears still struggling in some measure against a legal Christianity (1 Tim. i. 7), against "them of the circumcision" (Titus i. 10, 14), deprecating "contentions and strivings" about the law (Titus iii. 9). He still opposes to salvation by works salvation by the grace of God in Christ (2 Tim. i. 9), and to righteousness by works justification by God's grace (Titus iii. 5, 7). Nor is it, Hilgenfeld admits, any deviation from the genuine teaching of St. Paul that, in Tit. iii. 8, 14, Christians are exhorted to maintain good works, since this corresponds to the general purpose of the Epistles. In a word, the old characteristics of St. Paul are before us distinctly, and all that is new corresponds to a new situation.

Up to this point, in short, we cannot but conclude that every argument which has been adduced against the authenticity of the Epistles has, when more closely examined, told in their favour. There remains one other objection, to which a satisfactory answer can be made, but which is not quite capable of a similarly complete elucidation. This is the objection derived from the nature of the heresies and errors which are denounced in the Epistles. Baur, as we have mentioned, maintained that these heresies were those of definite Marcionism. This contention, however, may now be said to be practically without defenders. Even Hilgenfeld, who still believes[1] that Baur was right in the main in holding that the Pastoral Epistles can only be conceived as a product of the time of Gnosticism, admits at the same time that he gave too wide an extension to Marcionism. The description, in fact, of the strange teachers (1 Tim. i. 7) as "desiring to be teachers of the law" is in direct contradiction with Marcionism; for its most prominent feature was an absolute repudiation of the law, and of the God who gave it. It is true that some Marcionite practices correspond with those of the ascetic teachers mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4, as "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats." But the manner in which St. Paul refutes this error proves that it cannot in this instance have arisen from Marcionite principles. Marcion's reason for abstinence was because creation was not the work of the good God, but of the God of the Old Testament. Any one, therefore, who desired to controvert Marcion on this point would assert that a good God had made all things. But the Apostle's reply is (v. 4) "Every

[1] *Einleitung*, p. 759.

[1] *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.* 1880, p. 449.

Digitized by Google

creature of God is good." That is to say, he takes for granted, as what was not denied by his opponents, that the God of the Gospel had made all things; and he seems to be simply referring to the statement in the book of Genesis that God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.

Such considerations tend to shew decisively that the errors combated in the Epistles have no relation whatever to Marcionism. It is, however, evident that they have at all events an affinity with the Gnostic errors which subsequently grew to such a height; and the question is whether this affinity necessarily implies that they belonged to a later date than that of the last years of St. Paul's life. Now it should be borne in mind in the first place that our knowledge of the details of Church history during the thirty years which followed St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome is very imperfect and obscure. These Epistles, on the assumption of their date for which we are contending, would afford our most definite information respecting the state of the Churches of Asia Minor in the first part of that period, except what may be inferred from the messages to the Seven Churches in the Book of the Revelation. Whether, indeed, we adopt or not the earlier date now very frequently accepted for the Book of the Revelation, there is certainly nothing in those messages inconsistent with the description of the false teachers in the Pastoral Epistles. On the contrary, the mention in the message to the Church of Ephesus of "them which say they are Apostles, and are not," and in the message to the Church of Smyrna, "of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan" corresponds closely to the description of the false teachers whom Timothy had to resist. In particular, the fact that at Ephesus there were those who said they were Apostles, and were not, might throw some light on St. Paul's strong reiteration to Timothy of his Apostolic authority. However this may be, what we are concerned to observe is that there are no sufficient grounds for assuming that such errors as St. Paul denounces did not exist at Ephesus at the time supposed. The utmost that can be shewn is that errors akin to these, but, as is on all hands acknowledged, by no means identical, existed a generation later. But this, so far as it goes, is rather a reason for thinking it probable that the germs of the same errors were previously in existence, gradually changing their form and becoming more developed. At any rate, when we know so little of the early growth of Gnosticism, it is arbitrary in the extreme to pronounce that the form of error described in the Pastoral Epistles could not at the time supposed have existed at Ephesus.

But it is further to be observed that there are decided indications of the errors in question belonging to an early stage of that movement which at length developed the distinct Gnostic sects. One of the few things on which we can rely respecting the early history of Gnosticism is that it sprang out of Judaism. We may refer on this point to Dr. Salmon's article on Gnosticism in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (vol. ii. p. 681). Now side by side with the partially Gnostic features of the errors denounced in the Pastoral Epistles are Jewish characteristics. The strange teachers are "of the circumcision," they "desire to be teachers of the law," they profess "Jewish fables." Of the two influences thus existing side by side there can be no doubt; and the only question is how to explain their combination. In a very recent investigation into the subject, Holtzmann (*Pastoralbriefe*, 1880; pp. 126–153), who rejects the authenticity of the Epistles, seeks an explanation in the desire of the forger to give a colouring of St. Paul's time to his composition. It is argued that the errors really in view were Gnostic errors of a later date than St. Paul, but that the writer clumsily drags in some reminiscences of St. Paul's day to keep up the illusion. Hilgenfeld, in the article already quoted from his *Zeitschrift* (p. 452, &c.), opposes to this supposition his own strange view that though both Jewish and Gnostic errors are mentioned by the Apostle in almost the same breath, they are to be regarded as en-

Digitized by Google

tirely apart from each other, and as having no organic connexion. Why should all this ingenuity be exerted to explain away the simple fact, apparent on the face of such admissions, that the errors in question were really in the Judæo-Gnostic stage? It is shewn in the Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians in this work that this particular form of error was even then in existence, and what can be more natural than that a few years afterwards it should have reached a somewhat further development—a development, however, of which it is difficult, in the absence of other contemporary information, to fix the precise character? If, in short, the Epistles are on other grounds accepted as genuine, then the explanation of these errors which conforms to the most obvious and natural interpretation of St. Paul's language appears in harmony with the other circumstances of the case. They are early Gnostic heresies, precisely in that intermediate stage of development through which, on other grounds, we have every reason to believe they passed.

With respect to the remaining question—that of the stage of *ecclesiastical* organisation exhibited in the Epistles, similar considerations apply. We refer for more particular explanations to the notes which follow on the text of the Epistles, especially on 1 Tim. iii. It will be enough here to say that, on the one hand, the organization represents a distinct advance from the condition of the Church exhibited in St. Paul's other Epistles, and that, on the other hand, it is still short of the stage when episcopal government was clearly developed and established. We see the outlines of that form of government firmly drawn, but the very titles of the two superior offices—of Bishops and Presbyters—are still interchangeable. The conditions are neither those of the early apostolic age, nor those of the end of the first century, still less of the second. They exhibit an intermediate stage in a transition which must have occurred, but which may well have varied in its rapidity in different churches, and the details of which it is very difficult to follow in particular instances. The indications, therefore, of the date of the Epistles thus afforded suit precisely the period to which, on other grounds, we have assigned them.

We may now review the contents of the First Epistle to Timothy and of the Epistle to Titus, and we shall obtain a final corroboration of all that has hitherto been urged. The First Epistle to Timothy is distinguished from the second by being less personal in its motive and spirit, and by being more expressly directed to the public duties with which he had been entrusted by the Apostle. St. Paul commences by saying that Timothy had been left at Ephesus in order that he might charge some that they teach no strange doctrine, nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying—or a dispensation of God—which is in faith, and he declares that the end or purpose of the commandment is "love out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." To promote the attainment of this end should be Timothy's main object; and after once more denouncing the errors by which men were being led away from it, St. Paul proceeds in the second chapter to describe the public life of the Church, and the duties and qualifications of its various members. He commences with the duty of common prayer for all men, "for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." This concern for the good order of the world in general, and for the due maintenance of temporal authority, is eminently characteristic of St. Paul, and, as he intimates (ii. 7), is connected with the special apprehension which was given to him of the relation of the church to the Gentiles and to the world at large. In this public worship, he directs that the men should pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting, the women being present in modest apparel, but in silence and not presuming to teach. Then the Apostle passes to the internal organization of the Church, and describes the qualifications, first of a bishop and then of a deacon. From the omission of an intermediate grade, the "bishops"

Digitized by Google

(ἐπίσκοποι) are here evidently the presbyters subsequently referred to, and whom Titus is instructed (i. 5) to ordain in every city. Within the church thus organized, Timothy is to contend against the errors which the Apostle foresaw, himself being an example to the believers in all his conduct. He is to give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, and not to neglect the special gift that is in him. The Apostle then proceeds to give a number of practical directions as to the manner in which Timothy should conduct himself in his relations to the various classes of his flock—to elder and younger men, the elder and the younger women, and particularly in reference to the widows, of whom the Church from the first (Acts vi. 1) took special care, but whose management also seems to have occasioned no little difficulty. There follow a few practical directions to Timothy himself. As the Apostle draws to a close, one additional suggestion after another occurs to him; out of the fulness of his heart he passes from fervent exhortation (ch. vi. 11) to simple precepts (v. 17); and at length concludes by entreating Timothy "to keep that which is committed to his trust (v. 20)." It has been noted with some surprise that, contrary to St. Paul's usual custom, the Epistle ends without salutations; and Bleek (*Einleitung*, p. 571, ed. 3) actually makes this omission the primary and even sufficient ground on which he rejects this Epistle, while acknowledging the authenticity of the other two. But, as we have observed, the Epistle bears the character of a formal charge to Timothy himself. It is written for that purpose and for that only, and would hardly therefore have afforded an appropriate opportunity for the mention of other persons and other interests. In the parallel Epistle to Titus, there are also no salutations at the close, but simply directions to Titus respecting matters of business in which he would have to act with others. The latter Epistle closely resembles the first to Timothy, in a briefer form. Its directions are substantially the same; but its independence is valuable, as shewing that St. Paul organized on the same principles the different churches which he founded. The particular points which we have thus summarized will be found fully explained in the Commentary on the text.

We may thus conclude with all confidence that we have in these three Epistles a picture of the Church of the first days as it emerged from the tutelary care of the Apostles. The picture is one which, amidst all its shadows, presents the ideal in the pursuit of which the Church of subsequent centuries has found its utmost energies exerted; and we may observe, in conclusion, that it bears in every line the impress of the combined enthusiasm and strong practical wisdom of St. Paul. "One feels," says even Renan, "the influence of St. Paul, a sort of sobriety in mysticism, and across the strangest aberrations of faith in the supernatural, a great foundation of uprightness and sincerity."[1] It is by a similarly wonderful combination—to translate this admission into Christian language—of the loftiest faith in the mysteries of godliness with profound practical wisdom, that the sacred writings are throughout characterized; and it is a combination of which no instance can be shewn in those apocryphal and forged productions among which it has been attempted to range these Epistles.

[1] *L'Église chrétienne*, p. 105.

Digitized by Google

# THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO

# TIMOTHY.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *Timothy is put in mind of the charge which was given unto him by Paul at his going to Macedonia.* 5 *Of the right use and end of the law.* 11 *Of St. Paul's calling to be an apostle,* 20 *and of Hymenæus and Alexander.*

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ, *which is* our hope;

2 Unto Timothy, *my* own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.

3 As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine,

4 Neither give heed to fables and

---

CHAP. I. 1, 2.—ADDRESS AND SALUTATION.

1. *an apostle . . . by the commandment of God,*] "Not of men, neither by man," Gal. i. 1. The designation *God our Saviour*, not in the sense of Preserver, but of Redeemer in Jesus Christ, is almost peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim. ii. 3, iv 10; Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4. It occurs, however, in Jude 25, and in the hymn of the Virgin Mary in Luke i. 47. The *idea* is found in St. Paul's other Epistles, *e.g.* 2 Cor. v. 19. Cf. Isaiah xii. 2, xlv. 15.

*and Lord Jesus Christ.*] **And of Christ Jesus.** The reading preferred by most commentators with A, D, F, G. *Lord* (κυρίου), however, is sustained by ℵ, D[3], J, K.

*our hope.*] The object, foundation, and substance of our hope. So Col. i. 27, "Christ in you, the hope of glory." In Eph. ii. 14, Christ is called "our peace."

2. *my own son.*] My own true son; not, however, in the flesh, but "in the faith," which constitutes the close spiritual relationship of a convert. Cf. Philemon 10; Gal. iv. 19. Writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 17), St Paul calls Timothy his "beloved son and faithful in the Lord."

*mercy.*] An addition to St. Paul's usual salutation, "grace and peace," peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles. "Teachers," says St. Chrysostom, "have the greatest need of mercy." Peace and mercy are joined in Gal. vi. 16.

3-18. The purpose for which Timothy was desired to continue at Ephesus, leading to a digression on the wrong and right use of the Law in its agreement with the Gospel. and thence to a further digression on the mercy of God in converting Paul and entrusting him with the ministry. The habit of digressing, or "going off at a word," as it has been called, is a well-known characteristic of St. Paul's writings.

3. The sentence is left incomplete, again in accordance with St. Paul's style, which is ever governed by sequence of thought, rather than by rules of rhetorical or even grammatical arrangement. "Even as I besought thee to remain at Ephesus when I was on my way to Macedonia, in order that," &c., "so I beseech you still."

*when I went.*] Rather, **"when I was going."** See Introduction. It cannot be certainly determined from these words whether St. Paul visited Ephesus at this time. He might have left Timothy in passing, or have sent him there; and thus his expectation, when he parted from the elders of that Church at Miletus, that they would see his face no more, Acts xx. 25, might be literally fulfilled.

*that thou mightest, &c.*] **In order that thou mightest charge**, authoritatively, **some** (not important, probably, either in numbers or influence) **not to be teachers of other doctrine**—other than that which I have taught, and you have learned. The word ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν implies more than to teach other doctrine: it is to assume the office of a teacher. Its opposite is "teachers of good things," καλοδιδασκάλους, Tit. ii. 3.

Digitized by Google

endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: *so do.*

5 Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and *of* a good conscience, and *of* faith unfeigned:

6 From which some [1]having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling;

[1] Or, *not aiming at.*

7 Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.

8 But we know that the law *is* good, if a man use it lawfully;

9 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for un-

---

For the character of the erroneous teaching, see note at the end of the chapter.

4. *fables and endless genealogies.*] Of these the *fables*, myths, are preserved in abundance in the Talmud; and it is more reasonable to look for the "genealogies" in the mystic interpretations of the Jewish schools than to assume them to be the anachronisms of a forger who had transplanted into an Epistle to be attributed to an Apostle the succession of æons, or personal emanations from the Deity, which were taught a century later by Marcion and Valentinus. Philo, the Jew, who was teaching at Alexandria during the time of our Lord's ministry, dividing the writings of Moses into historical and genealogical, says of the genealogical that "part is concerning the punishment of the impious, part concerning the reward of the just;" which, as Pressensé observes, genealogies can only be when they are interpreted allegorically. And, indeed, it is well known that Philo found in the genealogies a whole system of psychology. The names with him represented the various conditions of the soul: *τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς*. Something of this kind were, probably, the "endless genealogies" of the Ephesian teachers. So Ignatius (*ad Magn.* viii.), where this passage of the Apostle seems to have been in the writer's mind. *Μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὖσιν· εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαισμὸν* (al. *νόμον*) *ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι.* "Do not be deceived by heterodox teachings nor by ancient fables, which are unprofitable: for if up to this time we live according to Judaism" (or according to the law) "we confess that we have not received grace."

*which minister questions, &c.*] Rather, **inasmuch as they minister questions** of controversy, **rather than God's dispensation,** i. e. the Gospel, **which stands in faith,** not in idle questions nor in the law. The word *which* in A. V. ("*which minister*") is more than the relative, and implies the reason. "*Dispensation,*" *οἰκονομίαν*, with ℵ. and all the best MSS. (not "edifying:" *οἰκοδομίαν*) is undoubtedly the right reading.

5. *Now the end, &c.*] But the aim of the commandment, or precept, not of the law only, nor of the Gospel merely, but of all practical teaching as opposed to fables, &c., is *love out of a pure heart and out of a good conscience:* a conscience which trusts that its guilt is removed and that it is reconciled to God (Heb. ix. 9, 14), and which is being trained to be void of offence towards God and towards men (Acts xxiv. 16); and *out of faith unfeigned,* which is the root of love (Gal. v. 6), and which purifies the conscience (Acts xv. 9). Unless faith is real, the guilt is not removed and the training of the conscience is not attempted.

6. *From which some having swerved.*] Rather, **having missed their aim at which.** Such, argues the Apostle, is the real object of all practical teaching; but "some," the some, probably, who were alluded to in ver. 3, having missed their aim at all this, have turned away to vain talking.

7. *nor whereof they affirm.*] **Nor what it is concerning which they make such strong assertions.**

8. *But we know that the law is good.*] As these men say it is. This is readily conceded, "provided that one" (in his teaching) "use it agreeably to the design of a law," *i. e.* for the purpose of restraining evil-doing. This verse is irreconcilable with the theory that the writer was opposing the Marcionites, and must, therefore, have written in the 2nd century. Marcion taught that the law was evil; those whom the writer of this Epistle had in view evidently asserted it to be good, which he concedes, provided that it is applied to its due purpose.

9. *the law.*] Better **law**: law in general, including of course the Mosaic law. It is doubtful whether "law" when anarthrous, is ever used by St. Paul for the law of Moses *exclusively*, though it may be, when that law is in his mind the most prominent. See Rom. ii 12, note: Cf. Rom. ii. 14 and note, with the remarkable passage from Aristotle (Polit. III. xiii. 14).

9. *a righteous man.*] *I. e.* for a just and

Digitized by Google

holy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

10 For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;

11 According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.

12 And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry;

13 Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did *it* ignorantly in unbelief.

14 And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.

15 This *is* a faithful saying, and

---

virtuous man, the opposite of the character which follows: not here a justified man, true though it is that justice and virtue and all Christian graces follow after justification and are the fruits of faith. If all were righteous, there would be no need of law.

*for the lawless and disobedient.*] Who break the law; *the ungodly and sinners*, who rebel against God; *the unholy and profane* in their own impure lives.

11. *According to.*] Referring not to "sound doctrine," which would require the article in the Greek, nor to things "contrary to sound doctrine," which would be weak and tautological, but more probably to all of the preceding sentence from ver. 9. "All which teaching is in accordance with the Gospel."

*the glorious gospel.*] Rather, **the Gospel**, the good tidings, **of the glory of God**, as revealed especially in the incarnation and death of Jesus Christ and the salvation of man.

*which was committed to my trust.*] A form of speech frequent with St. Paul. Cf. Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 4. So Titus i. 3.

12. The mention of the great trust committed to him awakens a train of grateful memories in the Apostle's mind, which he pours out in one of his characteristic digressions; a digression, however, which has indirectly an important bearing on his subject, showing how in his own case the Gospel did what the law could not do—transformed a blasphemer into a saint.

12. *And I thank Christ, &c.*] Rather, **And I give thanks to Him who empowered**, or put power into. me, **Christ Jesus our Lord**. The word "empowered" is the same which is used in Acts ix. 22 of Paul ("and Saul increased the more in strength," A. V.), and is elsewhere in the N. T. employed only by the Apostle himself.

*for that.*] Rather, **that**: the object of his thanksgiving was. "He accounted me faithful"—faithfulness being the divinely-required qualification for the work—"appointing me to the ministry." Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 4, "as we were allowed"—rather, "approved"—of God to be put in trust with the Gospel."

13. *Who was.*] *I.e.* "Me who was," or, "although I was before a blasphemer" (in words), "and a persecutor" (in deed), "and an insulter" (in spirit).

*in unbelief.*] In my then state of unbelief.

14. *And.*] **But**, *the grace*, *i.e.* free mercy.

*with.*] *I.e.* bringing with it faith and love to God and man, which have their root *in Christ Jesus*; faith and love being, as Calvin says, signs and testimonies of the grace of God.

15. *This is a faithful saying.*] This expression is found only in the Pastoral Epistles, in which it occurs in 1 Tim. iii. 1, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Titus iii. 8. A comparison of these passages will hardly bear out the opinion that these "faithful sayings" are always quotations from hymns or liturgical formularies, although the present passage, with iv. 9 and 2 Tim. ii. 11, may be Christian maxims or sayings in use in the Churches. Their occurrence, therefore, may be another indication that these three Epistles were written late in the Apostle's ministry; and it certainly leads towards the conclusion that they were all written about the same time.

*worthy of all acceptation.*] By all men, everywhere.

*that Christ Jesus came into the world.*] With a definite allusion to the pre-existence before "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."

*of whom I am chief.*] Literally, "first;" not, however, in time, but in excess; not "the first who sinned," or "the first of sinners who was saved," but, as our Version, "of sinners the chief." "Not because he sinned first, but because he sinned most,"

Digitized by Google

worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.

16 Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.

17 Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, *be* honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

18 This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare;

19 Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck:

20 Of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.

---

says Augustine. The tense is instructive: of whom I *am* chief, not I *was*. A pardoned sinner is a sinner still.

16. *first.*] Probably **as chief**, with reference to the last verse, though to the Greek reader the other idea of priority would also be conveyed.

*all longsuffering.*] Literally, "the all longsuffering," *i.e.* All that longsuffering of his.

*for a pattern.*] The first draught or sketch to serve as the outline for all future times. But what is the pattern? The usual, and perhaps the correct, explanation is that Paul himself is the typical instance of a notorious sinner saved by the forbearance and mercy of Christ; but it may be the longsuffering of Christ in St. Paul's case which is the pattern of all such unbounded longsuffering for those who should hereafter believe on Him.

17. On the recollection of these mercies the Apostle breaks forth in a doxology, as in Rom. xvi. 25–27; 1 Tim. vi. 16.

*unto the King eternal.*] Literally, King of the ages, τῶν αἰώνων, suggested probably by "everlasting," αἰώνιον, at the end of the last sentence,—of all those successive epochs and dispensations which together made up in the Hebrew mind the idea of eternity.

*immortal.*] Incorruptible; who neither perishes nor changes

*the only wise God.*] Rather, **the only God.** The word "wise" is not in the best MSS.

18. *This charge.*] It has been doubted whether the reference is to what precedes in vv. 3–5, or 15, or to what follows. But ver. 15 is not a command, and the injunctions in the other two passages are complete. The injunction here is "to war the good warfare," in doing which, however, Timothy would, no doubt, be also obeying the foregoing commands.

*I commit.*] Solemnly.

*according to, &c.*] "In accordance with the prophecies which went before concerning thee;" *i.e.* the prophetical utterances previous to his ordination, which marked him out for his office and sanctioned the laying on of hands. So in Acts xiii. 12, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them" was the "prophecy" which went before their ordination. The designation of Timothy to the Ministerial office might be accompanied with a prediction or exhortation that he would prove himself a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

*that . . . by them.*] Clad in them, as in armour. Cf. 1 Peter iv. 1, "Arm yourselves with the same mind."

*war a good warfare.*] Rather, **the** good warfare, which every minister of the Gospel has to wage. Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 7.

19. *Holding faith, and a good conscience.*] Which are ever closely bound together. A bad conscience is a source of unbelief, and faith purifies the conscience.

*which.*] A good conscience.

*having put away.*] Rather, **having thrust from them**, wilfully and deliberately, "as a troublesome monitor" (Bengel).

20. *Hymenæus* is mentioned again as an heretical teacher in 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, where one of his erroneous tenets is stated to be that "the resurrection is past already." Of *Alexander* nothing is known, unless he be the same with "Alexander the coppersmith," referred to by St. Paul in 2 Tim. iv. 14, as having done him much evil.

*may learn.*] May be taught by chastisement. See 1 Cor. v. 3–5 and notes. This seems to have been a judicial punishment, inflicted with the view of bringing the offender to repentance; sometimes, as here, by the Apostle himself; sometimes by his authority, together with that of the Church, as in the case of the incestuous Corinthian; and to have consisted in a solemn delivering over of



Digitized by Google

the offender to Satan, in order to the infliction by Satan of some bodily disease or suffering, to be continued, it would appear, till on his repentance the penitent was restored by the Church. It was, therefore, different from, though probably accompanied by, excommunication, or exclusion from the communion of the faithful. That the infliction of bodily disease was permitted to Satan, we have the authority not only of the Jewish Scriptures and Jewish belief, as in the case of Job, but of St. Paul, who calls his "thorn in the flesh," "the messenger of Satan to buffet him" (2 Cor. xii. 7), and of our Lord Himself (Luke xiii. 16), "This woman, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years."

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 3.

### The ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι in the Ephesian Church.

It is a groundless assumption that the errors prevalent at Ephesus and in Crete, which Timothy and Titus were to oppose, were identical with any of the developed forms of the Gnostic heresies, still less with the elaborate systems of Marcion and Valentinus; and with it falls the argument drawn from this assumed identity, which assigns these Epistles, or either of them, to the second century. We may, however, see in these errors the Gnostic heresies *in early process of formation:* a process which, in accordance with the laws of the development of thought, *must* have taken place at some time, and which in order to produce the phenomena of the end of the first and the first half of the second centuries must have been going on, at least during the later period of St. Paul's life and ministry. The elements, indeed, were in existence, and were beginning to enter into various combinations, as early as Christianity itself. Jewish speculation, although confined within the limits of the Sacred Books, had found in them abundant matter for mystical interpretation, if it had not also imported some Magian tenets. The Dualism of the East, with its rival principles of good and evil, the latter of which either was itself, or was the origin of, matter, had been spreading westward, and had brought with it both of its opposite, but equally logical, results—a stern asceticism and an unblushing licentiousness. And Greek philosophy, as remodelled by the Neo-Platonicians of Alexandria, was coalescing with both the other elements, taking up into itself the not uncongenial theories of the East, and leading to new and ingenious interpretations of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, by which the words of Moses and the Prophets were made the vehicles, if not claimed as the origin and prototypes, of the dogmas of the Academy. By degrees these elements, combined in different proportions and under various influences, began also to attach themselves to the doctrines of Christianity. What had been philosophies without the Church, became heresies within it; and St. John, probably at the close of the first century, and Irenæus, Theophilus, and Tertullian, with many others, in the second, had to defend the Gospel itself against the fantastic, but seductive, errors of the various Gnostic sects. As yet, however, these errors were existing only in their rudiments, and the notions, which went to make them up, were held probably in different proportions in different places. At Ephesus, while Timothy was there, it would seem to have been the Jewish element which prevailed; not—as previously in Galatia, and partially, perhaps, at Rome—a dogmatic system which insisted on circumcision and the acceptance of the whole Mosaic Law as necessary to salvation; but rather, a tendency to exalt the Law, as expounded probably by mystic interpretations and Rabbinical traditions, to a counsel of perfection which would raise the Christian to higher degrees of holiness. These opinions, therefore, are treated by the Apostle not so much as *heresies*, in the later sense of the term, which cut off those who held them from the Church, but rather as mischievous errors which endangered the health of the spiritual life. Of the same general character as the unsound doctrines which infested the Church at Colossæ, they do not appear to have run up so far into that mystic theosophy as, *e.g.*, "the worshipping of angels," which was apparently the basis of the heresy of Cerinthus towards the close of the century and the link of these errors with Gnosticism, properly so called; but as regards deterioration of morals, both in principle and practice, their effect would seem to have been worse. (Cf. Bp. Lightfoot on the Colossian Heresies in his edition of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon.)

---

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER II.

1 *That it is meet to pray and give thanks for all men, and the reason why.* 9 *How women should be attired.* 12 *They are not permitted to teach.* 15 *They shall be saved, notwithstanding the testimonies of God's wrath, in childbirth, if they continue in faith.*

I [1]EXHORT therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, *and* giving of thanks, be made for all men;

[1] Or, *desire.*

2 For kings, and *for* all that are in [1]authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

[1] Or, *eminent place*

3 For this *is* good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour;

4 Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

5 For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;

---

CHAP. II.—CHURCH REGULATIONS.

I.—PUBLIC WORSHIP.

1. *I exhort therefore.*] In pursuance, *i.e.* of the general commandment just given (i. 18), now to be pursued into detail.

*that, first of all.*] Rather, **first of all that**: first, in order of direction, and perhaps of importance; not in regard to the time when prayer was to be used, as Chrysostom, who refers the passage to the daily *morning* prayer: but *whenever* common prayer is used I exhort, &c.

*supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men.*] Not merely for ourselves or for the Church. It is difficult to establish a clear distinction between the three words used by the Apostle for prayer. Perhaps, as suggested by Bishop Ellicott, and in the main by Bp. Wordsworth, the idea most prominent in the first, δεήσεις, "supplications," is that of want; in the second, προσευχαὶ, "prayers," that of solemn devotion; ("it can only be applied to God," Bp. Wordsworth); in the third, ἐντεύξεις, "intercessions," that of individual earnest pleading with God. In this passage they all imply intercessions, in the ordinary sense of the word, as they are all, as well as thanksgiving, to be made "for all men."

2. *For kings, and for all that are in authority.*] The plural is used in a general sense for "whoever happens to be king." It is a perverse ingenuity which led Baur to imagine in this plural an allusion to the Emperor and his assessors, and therefore to place this Epistle in the time of the Antonines. This use of the plural for persons or things taken generally is common in all languages. The Jews were enjoined to pray for the heathen state under which they lived, Jer. xxix. 7, and cf. Ezra vi. 10.

*that.*] **In order that,** *i.e.* by the wisdom and moderation of their rule, which we pray for.

*in all godliness and honesty.*] Or, "gravity," both of which are endangered by wars or seditions and persecutions. "Honesty," as used by our translators, means more than integrity, retaining much of the sense of the Latin *honestas;* that which is good and appears good to others, respectable and respected.

3. The connexion is, For the practice which I enjoin of praying for all men, including kings and magistrates although heathen and possibly persecutors, is both "good" in itself and "acceptable in the sight of our Saviour, God, whose will it is that *all* men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." Our prayers should be as comprehensive as God's will.

*God our Saviour.*] See i. 1, and note.

*the knowledge.*] The **full knowledge.** Salvation is in virtue and aim universal. Christ died for all, and His blood cleanseth from all sin. God's will, thus revealed, is for "all men to be saved." But He does not will to save all men irrespective of their own acceptance of the terms of salvation. He wills them to be saved on certain conditions; to come to the full knowledge of the Gospel; knowledge, *i.e.* not merely intellectual but moral, influencing the affections and life. This full knowledge, then, will include penitence, faith, love, and obedience. It may be that in the term ἐπίγνωσις *full* knowledge, used so frequently in the Pastoral Epistles, there may be a tacit opposition to γνῶσις, knowledge, so much in the mouth of the earliest corruptors of Christianity, and which, a little later, gave them the appellation of Gnostics. Compare its frequent occurrence in the Epistle to the Colossians when the Apostle had similar errors in view.

5. Confirmatory of the position that God's will is that *all* should be saved. "The *universality* of the dispensation is proved by the unity of the Dispenser." Bp. Ellicott.

*For there is one God.*] Who is the Saviour of all, "one mediator too between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;" who being



Digitized by Google

6 Who gave himself a ransom for all, [1]to be testified in due time.

7 Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, *and* lie not;) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

8 I will therefore that men pray

[1] Or, *a testimony.*

---

*man*,—not merely a man, but the second Adam, representing in Himself the whole human race—is the Mediator of *all* men. It is the stress of the argument that the unity of the Mediator carries with it the universality of the mediation, which brings, in this passage, the *humanity* of the Mediator prominently forward. The Mediator between God and man is both God and man: but in order to *become* Mediator, it was necessary that the Son, who *is* God, should *be made* man; for "it was by being incarnate that he mediated," as Theodoret says. In Gal. iii. 20, where the same subject is treated, the prominence is given by the argument to the *Godhead* of the Mediator.

6. *Who gave himself a ransom for all.*] *I.e.* "in behalf of all." The preposition in ἀντίλυτρον, ransom, cannot be redundant; it adds the idea of exchange. He made Himself a ransom in exchange for us, in our behalf; redeemed life by life. Cf. ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, in Matt. xvi. 26, "in exchange for his soul." And see Pearson, *Vind. Ignat.* c xv., 'Ang. Cath. Theol.' p. 597. "What is this ransom, ἀντίλυτρον?" asks Chrysostom. "God was about to punish them: this He did not do; they were about to perish; but He gave His own Son instead of them . . . . He Himself offered Himself a sacrifice in behalf of His enemies." The doctrine of St. Paul in this passage, taken in its plain and literal sense, is distinctly that of our Church: "Almighty God, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

*to be testified in due time.*] Lit. "the testimony" (that which was to be testified of) "at the due seasons;" "due," *i.e.* as it seemed fit to the wisdom of God who revealed the truth. This refers to the whole previous passage. That there is one Mediator, incarnate to be Mediator, who gave Himself a ransom for all by His death, was the great truth which, "when the fulness of the time was come" (Gal. iv. 4) and onward to the second coming of the Lord, was to be testified of by Apostles, Evangelists and ministers of the Gospel. Cf. Titus i. 3.

7. *Whereunto.*] "For which testimony" as that which I too was to proclaim.

*I am ordained.*] **Was** ordained; "was duly appointed a preacher," or herald, "and an Apostle;" yes, an *apostle* whatever Judaizing teachers may say, although not of the twelve and born, as it were, out of due time: "I speak the truth, I lie not." The words *in Christ* are not in the best MSS.

*a teacher of the Gentiles.*] Especially such, as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

*in faith and verity.*] Probably "a teacher of them in the right faith and the truth to which God would have all men, including the Gentiles, to come." The words "in faith" may, however, refer subjectively to St. Paul, who taught in faith. A faithful teacher will teach the truth.

Some German commentators (as Schleiermacher and De Wette) have seen in the parenthetical affirmative, "I speak the truth, I lie not," the evidence of a late forgery imitating the manner of St. Paul on an occasion where such vehemence was uncalled for; and others have imagined it an instance of the habitual use of a phrase even where it was hardly necessary or justifiable. But unless the "teachers of the law" at Ephesus differed from Judaizers in Galatia, at Corinth, and elsewhere, there can be no doubt that they denied or depreciated St. Paul's Apostleship; and his strong asseveration, when asserting himself to be an Apostle, is therefore consistent as well with the circumstances of the case, as with St. Paul's usual style and trains of thought. It is, of course, true that Timothy himself did not need such assurance; but it is also true that this Epistle is official, not private; and, though not addressed to the Church, bears marks of being intended, for the most part, to be communicated to the Church.

8. *I will therefore.*] Return from the digression occasioned by the direction to pray for *all* men (vv. 1, 2) to other directions for public worship.

*that men.*] **That the men** in antithesis to the women (v. 9).

*pray every where.*] *I.e.* in every place where they pray, referring however to *public* prayer.

*lifting up holy hands.*] Unprofaned by violence or impurity. Cf. Ps. xxvi. 6: "I will wash my hands in innocency and so will I compass thine altar;" and Clement of Rome, who probably had St. Paul's words in his

Digitized by Google

every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.

9 In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with [1]broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array;

[1] Or, *plaited.*

10 But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works.

11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.

15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

---

mind[1]—"Let us then approach him in holiness of soul, lifting up pure and undefiled hands to him." Ad Cor. xxix. The well-known attitude of prayer among the Jews and early Christians, as well as among the Greeks and Romans, was the palms uplifted towards heaven—"tendens ad sidera palmas;" indicative of the *offering* of the petition and perhaps of the readiness to *receive* the gifts sought. Our posture of folded palms, said to be common to Indo-Germanic races, perhaps denotes *subjection* or *submission;* as when, in the act of feudal homage, the folded hands of the vassal are placed between the hands of the suzerain.

*without wrath and doubting.*] Or, possibly, "disputation" here and in Mark vii. 21; and Phil. ii. 14. It is in favour of the rendering of our version that the word διαλογισμὸς signifies "doubting" everywhere else in the N. T., that it was so understood by the early Greek expositors, as Chrysostom; and that it harmonizes with the teaching of our Lord (Mark xi. 24) and of St. James (i. 6, 7). Doubt, as well as wrath, hinders the efficacy of prayer. For the latter rendering it is urged that the verb διαλογίζομαι signifies to "dispute" in Mark ix. 33, and elsewhere; and that this at least possible sense agrees better with the context here and in Phil. ii. 14; for in both passages it is rather outward conflict of opinion, than the inward contest in the hesitating mind, which is deprecated; in the latter case as injurious to the Christian's blameless example; here, as obstructive of the unity of common prayer.

**9.** *In like manner . . . that women.*] **The women:** still continuing directions for public worship: "I will that the women," who as well as the men will be present; for there is no women's Court in the Christian temple.

*adorn themselves in modest apparel.*] The word may perhaps reach somewhat beyond dress and ornament to demeanour and deportment.

*with shamefacedness.*] An alteration made without authority by the printers of the word in the edition of 1611, which we still follow, for **shamefastness**; a shrinking from all that is indelicate and unbecoming.

*and sobriety.*] Sobermindedness, the well-balanced state of mind which results from habitual self-restraint. (See Bp. Ellicott and Archbp. Trench, Syn. of New Test.) The word σώφρων and its derivatives, except the verbs, occur only in the Pastoral Epistles, and there frequently; an indication that these epistles were written by the same hand, and perhaps at about the same time.

*broided hair.*] Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 3.

*gold, or pearls, &c.*] There would seem to have been in the Ephesian Church, as Mosheim observes in opposition to the taunts of Celsus and Julian, women of property who could afford such ornaments.

**11.** *Let the women learn in silence, &c.*] In public worship the men only are to teach as well as to pray. The Apostle had given the same injunction to the Corinthians, and had intimated that it was the universal regulation "in all the churches of the saints," 1 Cor. xiv. 33-36.

*nor to usurp authority.*] "**Exercise** authority." The particular prohibition concerning teaching in public, is expanded into a general precept.

**13, 14.** The reason for the prohibition is twofold: 1. The man was first in creation; 2. The woman first in transgression. "It was not Adam who was deceived" by the serpent; "but the woman being seduced by deceit" (Alford) "fell into transgression," the effects of which continue still. The preferable reading ἐξαπατηθεῖσα is stronger than ἀπατηθεῖσα, "thoroughly deceived," so deceived that deceit's fatal effects followed. Cf. St. Paul's reference to the temptation of the woman, 2 Cor. xi. 3.

[1] Προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντας πρὸς αὐτόν.

Digitized by Google

15. *Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing.*] Rather, **through her childbearing.** The key to this difficult passage must be found in Gen. iii. 16. The sentence on the woman was twofold. She was to be in subjection to the man: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee;" and she was to bring forth children in sorrow. But this latter part of her doom contained in two ways the conditions of her salvation. In the first place, in bearing its sorrows and fulfilling its resulting duties patiently and faithfully, she would be discharging the function which God had specially allotted to her. As labour, which was the man's sentence, has become man's duty, in doing which aright he is to serve God, so the mother's duties and sufferings are the woman's special function and probation, through which, as a condition, she will be saved. But, secondly, the woman's sentence of childbearing involved the appointed means of her own and of the world's salvation. *Her* seed was to bruise the serpent's head. And thus in a deeper sense, but consistent with the former, she will be "saved through her childbearing," as the instrument of the incarnation of Him, who, "when the fulness of the time was come" was "born of a woman." But her salvation is conditional: *if they*, *i.e.* the sex, *continue in faith and charity* (*i. e.* love), *and holiness with sobriety*, the sober-mindedness recommended in v. 9 as woman's true ornament.

---

## CHAPTER III.

2 *How bishops, and deacons, and their wives should be qualified,* 14 *and to what end St. Paul wrote to Timothy of these things.* 15 *Of the church, and the blessed truth therein taught and professed.*

THIS *is* a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.

2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigi-

---

### CHAP. III.—CHURCH REGULATIONS.

### II.—QUALIFICATIONS OF BISHOPS AND DEACONS.

In this and the two following chapters we trace the ecclesiastical organisation of a Christian Church in the transition period between the time when the Churches were under the immediate government of the Apostles (as Corinth, *e.g.* at the time when St. Paul wrote his Epistles to the Corinthians)—having now their own ministers, the superior grade of whom were called Episcopi, Bishops or Presbyters indifferently, and the inferior, Deacons; while the work of each was determined by the special gifts, *charismata*, bestowed by the Holy Spirit upon them,—and the form into which it had settled down, probably by the end of the first, certainly early in the second century, when each Church, or body of Christians in a city, had its one chief Pastor, then called specifically Episcopus, Bishop, together with its Presbyters and its Deacons. At Ephesus, where Timothy had been left by St. Paul to supply his place there as chief Pastor and Governor of the Church—(whether as a temporary arrangement or as a permanent appointment may be doubtful)—he had under him a body of episcopi or presbyters and a class of deacons, both of whom were to be chosen, ordained, directed, and, if necessary, admonished and punished by him. There seems, too, to have been an organised system of female helpers, widows, who were also under his superintendence, and a church fund for the relief of the poor, which he was to regulate. We have here, then, the *fact* of Episcopal government, differing little from the settled Episcopacy of the next age, excepting in the circumstances that the chief pastor held only an intermediary and perhaps temporary charge, as the locum tenens of the Apostles, and that the appellations of Bishop and Presbyter were applied indifferently to the higher order of ministers under him.

The title Episcopus, Overseer, which had been borne at Athens by political agents sent to overlook and regulate the affairs of their subject states, and had thus found a place in the Roman official nomenclature towards the close of the Republic, had been used by the Septuagint translators, somewhat indefinitely, as an official designation, and was applied *e.g.* to Eleazar, the son of Aaron, in Num. iv. 16, to the officers of the host in Num. xxxi. 14, and to civil officers, judicial or fiscal, in Isaiah lx. 17. Hence it probably suggested itself to Hellenistic and Gentile converts as a suitable designation for those church officers who had the pastoral oversight of the people.

The term Presbyter (or, abbreviated, Priest), Elder, from an appellation of age and thence of honour, had come also to be employed as a title of office, and was used by the Jews, not only for one class of the members of the Sanhedrim, but also for those who presided over every synagogue. It thence passed readily into the Christian Churches.

See Note at the end of the chapter.

1. *This is a true saying.*] See on i. 15.

*a good work.*] For the bishopric, or pres-

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, modest.
[2] Or, Not ready to quarrel, and offer wrong, as one in wine.

lant, sober, [1]of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;

3 [2]Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;

byterate, the overseeing of the Church, is, as St. Augustine remarks, the name of a work, not of a dignity.

It has been objected that at so early a time as that at which these Epistles profess to have been written, none would *desire* an office which brought only responsibility and peril. But the instance of Diotrephes (3 John 9), and the earlier warning of St. James, "be not many masters" (iii. 1), prove that even from unworthy motives such a desire was possible. But is there no such thing as a desire to devote oneself to the service of God and His Church, even at the risk of loss and suffering?

**2–7.** It has been objected that the qualifications here required for a bishop are too commonplace; only, for the most part, what should be found in every consistent Christian. The answer is, that it is precisely the consistency of his previous conduct and character, and his excellence in the relations of domestic and social life, which guarantee the fitness of one who desires the office, for the work of a bishop.

**2.** *the husband of one wife.*] *I.e.* if he be married. The precept does not *require* a bishop to be married, which, indeed, St. Paul himself, and probably Timothy, were not: but it is impossible to reconcile it with the prohibition of the marriage of the clergy. But what is to be understood by *the husband of one wife?* Do the words prohibit the polygamy of the clergy? or remarriage after divorce? or also remarriage in general after the death of the first wife? With respect to the first; polygamy, we learn from Josephus and Justin Martyr, was still held lawful among the Jews, and accordingly the Apostle is thought by most early commentators to have prohibited it in this passage. But though lawful, we have no evidence that it was a common practice; and it had probably gone out of use when brought into contact with Greek and Roman customs, in which it was unknown. There is no allusion to it elsewhere in the N. T.; although, being contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and to the original idea of marriage as laid down by our Lord (Matt. xix. 4, 6), it would seem to have required, had it existed, some notice for its regulation, if not for its prohibition. Nor is it probable that the Apostle would have forbidden to the clergy only a practice which, even in the laity, would have scandalised the heathen world. But it seems conclusive against this opinion that the same qualification is required of "widows taken into the number" (in v. 9) that she should have been "the wife of one man," where polygamy is out of the question.

But though polygamy was rare, divorce was widely prevalent both among heathens and Jews. In the later period of the Roman Republic and under the Empire divorce had become very common, and was practised without scruple or disgrace for trivial causes. Even Cicero divorced two wives in succession, with the first of whom he had lived thirty years. Nor had the practice been materially checked by the enactments intended to restrain it in the reign of Augustus. Among the Jews the frequency of divorce had called forth the rebuke of THE LORD even in the time of Malachi (ii. 14–16). It was allowed by their doctors on the most frivolous pretexts; and so deep had the idea of its lawfulness and expediency sunk into the Jewish mind, that our Lord's disciples, hearing him prohibit all divorce unless for the cause of adultery, exclaimed, "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry" (Matt. xix. 10). There was reason then for requiring as a qualification for ministers of the Church, and indeed for widows holding office in it, that they should not have been divorced and married again.

But did the prohibition extend to a second marriage after the death of a first wife or husband? The question is difficult; but probably it did. In the first place, the words are general, and there is nothing to limit them to a second marriage after divorce; so that if they do not apply, or are not confined, to the case of polygamy, they appear to reach to second marriages of all kinds. Again: it is clear that St. Paul, although in the case of the laity he permitted the remarriage of widows and widowers (1 Cor. vii. 9) and even recommended it for prudential reasons in the case of the younger widows (1 Tim. v. 14), yet considered it better, at any rate with regard to the circumstances of the times, that they should remain unmarried (1 Cor. viii. 8). And one of these circumstances might be the disrepute in which second marriages were held even among heathen writers. Certain, however, it is, that the view of the early Christian Church, as found in Hermas, Tertullian, Athenagoras, Clement Alex., Gregory Naz., and others, was that though a second marriage, after the first had been dissolved by death, was not unlawful, it was not expedient; that, as it was expressed afterwards by Chrysostom, although it is not prohibited by law, it is a thing against which much may be said. (In Tit. ii.

Digitized by Google

4 One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;

5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)

6 Not [1]a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.

[1] *Or, one newly come to the faith.*

7 Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

8 Likewise *must* the deacons *be* grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre;

9 Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.

---

hom. ii.) And if such was, in any degree, the estimation in which second marriages were regarded by believers and unbelievers in the Apostle's time, it is not improbable that they would be considered by him a disqualification for the offices in the Church which those who bore, were to have a good report "both of those within and of them which are without" (1 Tim. iii. 7). A precept, however, like this, grounded on prudential reasons, cannot apply strictly, but only analogically—that is, when circumstances are identical or similar in other ages of the Church. It would not hold where no prejudice against such marriages exists.

*vigilant.*] **sober** (as νηφάλιος is translated in v. 11) in its literal, probably, as well as its metaphorical sense.

*sober.*] **Self-restrained** and modest in inward habit.

*of good behaviour.*] So too in outward manifestation.

*apt to teach.*] *I.e.* both able and ready.

**3.** *given to wine.*] Rather, **violent over wine,** and hence violent in a similar manner from any other cause. To object to these prohibitions as obvious in themselves and unnecessary in a Christian community is to forget the low tone of morality in Grecian society, in which such habits carried little or no reproach.

**4.** *his own house.*] In antithesis to the house of God, v. 5. The submission and demeanour of his children will be a proof of his capacity for government, just as the conduct of Eli's sons marked the incapacity of an otherwise pious and good man.

**6.** *not a novice.*] *I.e.* a recent convert. For the ordination of such there was no necessity, if, as is probable, the Gospel had been preached at Ephesus for at least twelve or thirteen years.

*lifted up with pride*] Perhaps, "obscured, blinded by pride;" some render, "swollen, puffed up." The word is of somewhat doubtful meaning. In our version it is translated "proud" in 1 Tim. vi. 4, and "highminded" in 2 Tim. iii. 4.

*the condemnation of the devil.*] Luther explains "the devil" the slanderer, *i.e.* slanderous men; others, as Mosheim, calumniators. But this is against the analogy of Scripture, in which the διάβολος is the Spiritual Power of evil. But is "the condemnation of the devil" that which the devil hopes or causes? or that which he has incurred? The former sense is supported by the grammatical affinity of v. 7, where "the snare of the devil" is "the snare which the devil lays;" but the devil is never represented as judging or condemning, which is the office of God alone. "Non enim judicat, sed judicatur," says Bengel. Most probably "the condemnation of the devil" is that into which the devil fell. The passage then would seem to make pride the cause of the fall of Satan.

**7.** *Moreover.*] Not only ought he not to be a recent convert, of whom little can be known even within the Church, but also "he must have a good report from them which are without."

*lest he fall into reproach.*] Either from those within or from those without the Church.

*and the snare of the devil.*] Especially perhaps, the temptation to recklessness, or even apostasy, when a minister, and particularly a recent convert, in the first ardour of his zeal, finds himself an object of suspicion and reproach.

**8.** See note on Deacons at the end of chapter.

*doubletongued.*] Saying one thing to one man, another to another. Theodoret.

*not greedy of filthy lucre.*] The administration of the alms of the Church, for which the order of Deacons was originally instituted, was still one of its principal duties: hence the especial necessity of freedom from covetousness and of honesty in money matters, as a qualification.

**9.** *Holding the mystery of the faith.*] "Their faith's mystery:" having their belief in the revealed gospel contained, as it were, in a "pure conscience," a heart of integrity and purity. A mystery is that which, unknown or incomprehensible previously, has now been

Digitized by Google

10 And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being *found* blameless.

11 Even so *must their* wives *be* grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.

12 Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.

13 For they that have [1]used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.

[1] Or, *ministered.*

---

revealed; and when revealed, it has become the object of faith.

**10.** *And let these also first be proved.*] Even when they seem to be thus qualified; perhaps by giving the people opportunities of expressing their opinion, as is done in our "form and manner of making Deacons," by the previous notice given in church called the *si quis*, and by the interrogation to the congregation at the beginning of the Ordination service.

*being found blameless.*] "If they have no charge brought against them."

**11.** *Even so must their wives.*] Rather, **Women** [or **wives**] **must in like manner.** The Greek has no article. It is very difficult to determine whether by "women" we are to understand deaconesses as an order, or the wives of deacons. For the first, it is argued, that it is not likely that St. Paul, in his directions to Timothy, would omit all mention of an order which, in the case of Phœbe, appears to have existed at least at Cenchrea; that the expression, "in like manner," has just before, v. 8, introduced the mention of a new office; that the qualifications required include no special reference to domestic duties; and that in the case of the bishops, although "husbands of one wife," the qualifications of *their* wives are not alluded to. On the other hand, the evidence for the existence of an order of Deaconesses at this early date is far from clear; the mention of these "women" in the midst of—not after—the qualifications for the office of deacon, seems to point to the deacons' wives whose character would be material to their husbands' fitness, rather than to deaconesses unconnected with them; and it is probable that the wives of deacons whose office contained much more of the lay element than that of the bishop, would be more associated with them in their work, assisting them especially in the distribution of alms. And if it should appear that a class of female ministers is indicated by the Catalogue of Widows mentioned in v. 9, it becomes at least probable that "women" here is to be understood of the Wives of Deacons.

*slanderers.*] Possibly as being the more common fault in women, as the "double tongue" in men.

**12.** See vv. 2, 4.

**13.** *For.*] *I.e.* these qualifications are high, and ought to be so, "for those who have served the office of Deacons well," &c.

*purchase to themselves, &c.*] The interpretations of this controverted passage are in the main two, either of which may be drawn from the Greek word βαθμός, meaning either a step or stair by which to ascend, or a "degree or step" attained. 1. A high place in God's favour, either in this world or in the world to come, together with the privilege of coming boldly to Him (Heb. ix. 19; Eph. iii. 12) in the faith which is in Christ Jesus. 2. A high position in the Church in the estimation of its members, and, perhaps, by promotion to the superior orders, together with great boldness or freedom of speech, as a minister and preacher in the faith of Christ Jesus. This explanation may be illustrated by the position held by Philip *the Deacon*, as an honoured minister and a bold and successful preacher of the Gospel. (Acts vi. 5, viii. 5-40, xxi. 8, 9.) There are no traces indeed, in the times of the Apostles, or in the primitive Church, of its Ministers passing through the grade of Deacons to the order of Presbyters; though it would be difficult to prove that such a step was never taken then, as it was undoubtedly not long afterwards. The prayer in the Constit. Apost. (lib. viii. c. xviii.; Labbe, vol. i. p. 490) seems to have been framed on St. Paul's words rather in the sense of promotion to a high office. So Chrysost. Theophylact. The word "degree," βαθμός, came to signify an order in the Ministry. In our Ordinal we pray for the newly ordained Deacons that they "may so well behave themselves in this inferior office that they may be found worthy to be called unto the higher ministries in the Church." If it be objected that the Apostle would not have set before Deacons so low a motive to serve well, it may be replied, that he has already spoken of such a desire as laudable, v. 1; that the Priesthood brought with it, at the time, labour and peril still more than honour; and that even lower motives, so long as they are subordinate and kept in their due place, are ever recognised in the morality of the Gospel.

See Note at end of the chapter.

Digitized by Google

14 These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly:

15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and [1]ground of the truth.

[1] Or, *stay.*

16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

---

14. *These things.*] The foregoing directions I write unto thee, although I hope to come unto thee rather soon, τάχιον; sooner, perhaps, than these detailed instructions might lead thee to suppose; but I write that if I should tarry, &c.

15. *which is.*] Rather, **Inasmuch as it is**: and therefore holy ground.

*the living God.*] No lifeless idol, like the Diana of Ephesus, whose "house" was the chief ornament of the city and one of the wonders of the world.

*ground.*] Rather, **basement.**

*the pillar and ground of the truth.*] These words have been joined to the next clause, a full-stop being placed at "God" by Episcopius, Mosheim, Bengel, and other Protestant commentators, thus making "the mystery of godliness" the "pillar of the truth." Nothing, probably, but the recoil from the undue stress laid on the passage by the Church of Rome could have driven them to an interpretation which, if not positively ungrammatical, is singularly harsh, obscure, and feeble. Others refer the words to Timothy, "as being yourself the pillar of the truth," comparing Gal. ii. 9; but this meaning could scarcely be borne by the Greek, and is little in harmony with the context. The Church is the pillar and basement of the truth, because it sustains it, as Calvin says, by making it known by its preaching, by preserving it unmutilated and pure, and by transmitting it to posterity. So our Twentieth Article calls the Church "a witness and a *keeper* of Holy Writ."

16. *And without controversy.*] **Confessedly** great is the truth of which the Church is the pillar and basement, the revealed doctrine of the Incarnation.

*great is the mystery of godliness.*] The truth, unknown before, but now revealed, "of godliness," or the Divine life: The Son of God becoming the Son of man being in every sense the sole cause of the sons of men becoming the sons of God. Compare Col. i. 27, "this mystery . . . which is Christ in you, the hope of glory."

*God.*] **Who,** which is now generally admitted to be the true reading; not "God" nor "which." See Note at end of the chapter.

The "mystery of godliness" being well known to be the revealed truth of the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Word made flesh, the Apostle, constructing his language from the thought in his mind, rather than from the actual words used, goes on with the personal pronoun. In a somewhat similar manner, in the Epistle to the Colossians, he uses "mystery" in apposition with Christ; "this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you," i. 27; "the mystery of God, even Christ," ii. 2, assuming, as is most probable, the correct reading to be τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ. The whole passage, which is rhythmical and falls into three pairs of antitheses, bears strong marks of being a quotation from a primitive hymn (as Eph. v. 14) or a confession of faith (Bp. Ellicott). If so, it was necessary to pass to the personal pronoun in order to bring in the quotation.

*was manifest in the flesh.*] Rather, as in the margin, **manifested**: was incarnate, and therefore had a previous existence, in which He was not incarnate. Cf. John i. 1, 14; 1 John i. 1, 2, "The Life was manifested, and we have seen it."

*justified.*] But though thus made man, He was shown and proved to be just (cf. Matt. xi. 19, "wisdom is justified of her children"), to be perfectly righteous, as no other man since the Fall ever has been.

*in the Spirit.*] 1. By many of the early commentators, "spirit," when opposed to "the flesh," in the case of our Lord (as in Rom. i. 4; Heb. ix. 14; 1 Peter iii. 18), is explained to be His divine nature. But this explanation can hardly have place here; as it is in His human nature, because He was truly man, that it was needful for Him to be proved righteous. 2. Others take the spirit to be the Holy Spirit, which was given to Him without measure (John iii. 34), which came upon Him and manifested Him to be the Christ at His baptism, led Him to His temptation, and raised Him from the dead (Rom. i. 3, 4). 3. But "spirit," as used by St. Paul in antithesis to flesh, means usually the higher or spiritual part of man's being, which he has over and above the flesh, σάρξ, and the animal soul, ψυχή, and in which, when aided by God's Spirit – that Spirit which

Digitized by Google

"witnesseth with our spirit" (Rom. viii. 16) – takes place all moral action, the motives, desires, and habits of virtue and holiness. In this spiritual part, then, of the nature which He had assumed, and which in Him was united to His Divine nature, was the incarnate Word, "justified,"—proved, and acknowledged, notwithstanding His true manhood, to be perfectly just and holy. "Never man spake like this man," said the officers of His enemies (John vii. 46); "truly this man was a righteous man," "was the Son of God," confessed the Roman centurion: Luke xxiii. 47; Mark xv. 39.

*seen of angels.*] Who could not see Him before His incarnation, says St. Chrysostom. It may be so. The angels are said by St. Peter to "desire to look into" the mysteries of the Gospel. They, however, did see Him while on earth, at least at His nativity, His temptation, His agony, His resurrection, and His ascension.

*preached unto the Gentiles.*] For this mystery, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, &c., see Eph. iii. 1–11.

*received up into glory.*] And there remains. And thus in this rhythmical formula is briefly but pregnantly comprised the revealed truth of the Incarnation, of which the Church is to be the pillar and basis, and which Timothy was to maintain in the face of all the heresies which were soon about to arise.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 1, 8, 16.

### Bishops and Presbyters.

**1.** The proofs of the identity of "bishop" and "presbyter," in the language of the Apostle and probably till towards the end of the first century, may be thus briefly summed up. 1. St. Paul (Acts xx. 17) called to Miletus the "elders" or "presbyters" of the Church of Ephesus, but he addressed them as those whom the Holy Ghost had made "overseers," "bishops," ver. 28. Irenæus, however, says that the bishops were summoned. 2. In the opening of his Epistle to the Philipp. i. 1, he salutes the saints "with the bishops and deacons;" and it is most improbable that this Church should have several bishops and no presbyters, or that, if there were presbyters, they should be omitted in the salutation. 3. In this chapter of the 1st Epistle to Timothy he enumerates the qualifications of bishops and of deacons, making no mention of presbyters; but in v. 17–22, when speaking of the maintenance, discipline, and ordination of the ministers of the Church, he calls them presbyters or "elders." 4. St. Peter (1 Peter i. 2), addressing the presbyters, exhorts them (if the reading is correct) to exercise the office of bishop over the flock, "taking the oversight." Even Clement of Rome uses the appellation interchangeably, Ep. i. s. 42, 44. After this, in the second century, the distinction had been already made, and Ignatius and Polycarp restricted the term bishop to the chief officers of the Church. See Prof. Lightfoot on Philippians, pp. 94–96.

**8.** It has been doubted whether the office of deacon is identical with, or can be traced back to, the appointment of the seven in Acts vi., which, it is maintained, was a temporary office to meet a special emergency. The seven are nowhere called deacons; and Philip, the only one of the number of whom we read after Stephen's death (unless Nicolas gave his name to the Nicolaitans, Rev. ii. 6, which is very doubtful) is designated "the evangelist," Acts xxi. 8. But the circumstances which gave rise to the appointment were not peculiar to Jerusalem. Wherever a Church was planted, there would be the poorer members to be cared for, and it would not be desirable for the preachers of the Gospel to be all occupied in "serving tables." The solemnity of the appointment of the seven with prayer and the laying on the hands of the Apostles, has more the character of the ordination of a ministry than the designation to a temporary function. The terms διακονία and διακονεῖν occur not unfrequently in connexion both with the administration of temporal relief and the exercise of an office of the ministry requiring and receiving special spiritual charismata. We meet with deacons in the Church at Philippi (Phil. i. 1), and a deaconess in that at Cenchrea (Rom. xvi. 1), and, finally, in the Pastoral Epistles the Diaconate appears as a recognised Order. The primitive Church believed in the identity of the Order of Deacons with the institution of the seven. Not only does Irenæus speak of Stephen and the rest as deacons, but even as late as the fifth century the Church at Rome, although the presbyters were numerous, restricted the number of deacons to seven; and the Council of Neocæsarea (A.D. 315) forbade the number of seven to be exceeded in any city, however great. It was, indeed, to remedy the inconvenience caused by this limitation that an Order of Subdeacons was instituted. See Bingham, iii. 1, 3; Prof. Lightfoot on Philippians, p. 187.

Digitized by Google

16. The three various readings on this controverted passage are: 1. Θεός (or, as abbreviated in the MSS., ΘC) ἐφανερώθη, *God* was manifested. 2. ὅ (O) (scilicet μυστήριον), *which* (mystery) was manifested. 3. ὅς (OC) *who* was manifested. 1. The reading Θεός is supported by D[3] (Codex Claromontanus) of the 6th century, but only as altered by a later hand; by J and K of the 8th or 9th centuries; and by nearly all the cursive MSS. which begin from the 10th century. The Alexandrine A of the 4th or 5th century reads Θεός; but careful inspection of the passage, especially that made by Bishop Ellicott, shows that not only a coarse line over the O, but also the faint line within it, are additions by later hands, and that the original reading was ὅς. The Vatican MS. cannot be appealed to, because the jealousy of Rome has prevented accurate collation, and the edition published by Cardinal Mai proves to be not so much a faithful reproduction of the MS. as an edition of the New Testament grounded on it. Θεός is supported by the Arabic of the Polyglott and the Sclavonian versions. It does not seem to have been in the copies used by the early Fathers; but is quoted by Chrysostom—unless, as seems probable, his text has been altered—and more certainly by Theodoret, Joannes Damascenus, Theophylact, and Œcumenius, and apparently also by Eustatius and Macedonius, who, indeed, was accused of altering the reading to Θεός. The allusions to the text in Ignatius, the Apostolic Constitutions, and Hippolytus, are consistent with the other readings; and the passages quoted in favour of Θεός from Athanasius and Gregory Naz. are spurious, altered, or inapplicable.

2. ὅ is the reading of D (Codex Claromontanus), as originally written. It was adopted by the old Latin and the Vulgate versions, and is consequently the reading of almost all the Latin Fathers, excepting Jerome.

3. Ὅς is found in A (Codex Alex.), *see above*, in C (Codex Ephremi) of the 5th century, and in the recently-discovered Codex Sinaiticus ℵ. It is also read in F (Codex Augiensis), and G (Codex Boerniarianus), both of the 9th century. It is supported by the Gothic version, the Philoxenian (Syriac) in margin, and the Coptic. It was read by Epiphanius and Jerome, probably by Cyril Alex., and perhaps by Chrysostom.

The reading ὅς, therefore, has the support of the majority of the oldest and best MSS., and of the oldest versions excepting the Latin, while the authority of the Greek Fathers preponderates on the same side. The Latin Fathers, excepting Jerome, quote the Latin as they found it in the translation they used; so that their authority resolves itself into that of the Vulgate.

In estimating the internal evidence, it must be admitted that it is much more probable that ὅς should be altered into ὅ, or into Θεός, than the reverse. Ὅς is by far the most difficult reading: and it would be obvious to a transcriber to write ὅ as the correct relative after μυστήριον, or Θεός, as being both grammatically and theologically clearer, while accident alone could account for the substitution of ὅς for ὅ or Θεός; and it is highly improbable that the same accident should occur in the majority of the oldest and independent MSS. Considering, too, the important bearing of the reading Θεός on the theological controversies of the first three centuries and a half, it is scarcely possible that the passage, if Θεός were in the text as they read it, should not be found used polemically in the authentic remains of the Greek Fathers. For the same reason it would have been difficult to alter Θεός into ὅς without exciting remark and remonstrance, although Θεός might be accepted for ὅς as a clearer exponent of the same meaning. It is, indeed, worthy of notice that Macedonius, who lived at the beginning of the 6th century, is charged by later writers, Liberatus, Victor, and Hincmar, with having altered ὅς into Θεός. On the whole the evidence, external and internal, seems to require the admission of ὅς into the text instead of Θεός or ὅ. The doctrinal importance of this critical controversy has been much overrated. Whichever reading is adopted, it is *the personal Christ* which, however expressed, must be understood as the subject of the words "manifested," "justified," &c.:[1] and as His pre-existence is deducible from His manifestation in the flesh, His divinity is *implied* in the reading ὅς, or even ὅ, as conclusively as it is *expressed* in the reading Θεός. He who can accept the pre-existence of the Son without acknowledging His divinity, could explain away the full force of the reading "God." Arius would, perhaps, be satisfied with either reading: Socinus is confuted by the literal exposition of either.

[1] "De sensu parum aut nihil refert: cum personam circumlocutione significant Græci, quam citissime ad ipsam personam revertuntur. Ὅς non τὸ ῥητὸν sed τὸ σημαινόμενον spectat." Kidd, note in Porson's Tracts.

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *He foretelleth that in the latter times there shall be a departure from the faith.* 6 *And to the end that Timothy might not fail in doing his duty, he furnisheth him with divers precepts belonging thereto.*

NOW the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;

2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;

3 Forbidding to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.

4 For every creature of God *is* good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving:

5 For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.

---

CHAP. IV.—Digression to erroneous teaching already imminent, suggested by the above statement of the fundamental and comprehensive truth of the Incarnation.

1. *Now.*] **But**: notwithstanding the revelation of this great truth.

*the Spirit speaketh expressly.*] Not merely in such prophecies as our Lord's in Matt. xxiv., or the Apostle's own in 2 Thess. ii. 3 seq., but also probably by unwritten revelations made to him or others. Cf. Acts xx. 30; 1 John ii. 18; 2 Peter iii. 2, 3; Jude 18.

*in the latter times.*] Rather, **in later times**, times subsequent to those at which St. Paul was writing. The words are not equivalent to "the last days," ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, in 2 Tim. iii. 1; nor to "the last time," καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1 Peter i. 5 (cf. Jude 18), "the last days," ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, which all look onward to the close of the Christian dispensation; nor again to "these last days," ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, Heb. i. 2; or to "the end of the world," συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, Heb. ix. 26 (cf. 1 Cor. x. 11), which signify the last of God's dispensations to this world, *i.e.* the Christian dispensation itself. The errors St. Paul has in view, though germinating—some, indeed, being already held and taught, as by the Essenes—developed subsequently into such heresies as those of the Marcionites, Encratites, and Manichæans.

*seducing spirits.*] Spirits who lead astray, as opposed to the Spirit of Truth, who leads into the whole truth (John xvi. 13). Cf. 1 John iv. 1.

*doctrines of devils.*] *I.e.* doctrines taught by dæmons, the spirits of the false prophets or teachers, "many of whom," when St. John wrote, were "already gone out into the world;" not "doctrines concerning dæmons," whether inculcating dæmon worship, or speculating on their existence, origin, and relative rank, as, *e.g.*, in the Valentinian system of æons.

2. *Speaking lies in hypocrisy.*] Rather, **through the hypocrisy of liars**: the instrument by which some would be led to depart from the faith.

*having their conscience seared with a hot iron.*] *I.e.* the liars. The translation may be, "men branded on their own consciences," as slaves were with their master's brand,—the self-convicted slaves of sin. Our English Version has taken the idea of the loss of sensibility produced by the burning, for which it has the authority of Theodoret. Perhaps the "branding" might convey both associations to a reader accustomed to see the effects of the practice.

3. These ascetic tenets, which were held among the Jews by the Essenes, early endeavoured to find a place in the Christian Church. See Col. ii. 16. Clement of Alexandria speaks of those in his time, the end of the 2nd century, who called marriage fornication and the invention of the devil (Strom. lib. iii. c. 6, s. 49).

*know the truth.*] "Fully know" it; with allusion, perhaps, to "knowledge," Gnosis, a word already becoming technical, and much in the mouths of heretics and false teachers, cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1, 2. In those who have *really* known the truth is the design of creation fulfilled.

The stress of the argument here is evidently—not that God is the Creator of all these things, as if in opposition to the doctrine afterwards taught by the Gnostics, that material things were not made by God, but by an inferior being,—but that God, who is the Creator, created them for the use of His servants. Marcion *e.g.* taught that creation was not the work of a good God, but of the God of the Old Testament. So far, then, from this passage proving that the Epistle was written in post-Apostolic times, the writer, had he lived in the days of developed Gnosticism, *must* have noticed the tenet on which asceticism was *then* based, that the origin of all material things and enjoyments is evil: which he does not.

Digitized by Google

6 If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained.

7 But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself *rather* unto godliness.

8 For bodily exercise profiteth [1]little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

9 This *is* a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation.

10 For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust

[1] Or, *for a little time.*

---

5. *sanctified.*] Set apart and made meet for the godly use of Christian men.

*by the word of God and prayer.*] Which they use before partaking of it and enjoying it. The phrase "the word of God" has been very variously interpreted. 1. The Divine blessing on all created things in Gen. i. 22, 28. 2. The general declarations of God's Word. 3. The Divine Word, or Logos, by whom all things were made. All which explanations seem inadmissible, because all refer to the past; while here, by the word of God, meats, &c., are to be sanctified as often as they are used. 4. The prophetic spirit by which the giver of thanks speaks, referring to 1 Cor. xiv. 17, which would narrow the application of an evidently universal proposition to those who had the gift of prophecy. 5. The word addressed to God and prayer, which is tautological and an unexampled use of the words λόγος Θεοῦ. 6. The most probable explanation is, the Word of God, or Holy Writ, in the language of which the prayer and thanksgiving would be usually couched, as it is, e.g., in a "Grace before meat," given in the Apostolic Constitutions, vii. 49. "Blessed be Thou, O Lord, Who hast fed me from my youth; Who givest food to all flesh. Fill our hearts with joy and gladness, that, having always all sufficiency, we may abound unto all good works in Christ Jesus our Lord, through Whom be unto Thee, honour, glory, and power for ever and ever. Amen."

There would seem to be an allusion to the Eucharist, "the Lord's Supper," the type of all Christian banquets, in which it is probable that from the earliest times the words of institution were recited together with prayer and thanksgiving. And it is plain, from Rom. xiv. 6 and 1 Cor. x. 30, that giving of thanks at meals was a Christian practice; by which, indeed, St. Paul infers in the latter passage, that even meats, which had been offered to idols might be sanctified to the use of the believer. Such supplication and thanksgiving, expressed for the most part in the language of the Word of God, hallows those gifts which were also good by virtue of their creation, and enables those who use them in moderation and thankfulness, "whether they eat or drink, or whatsoever they do, to do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. x. 31). If this explanation be correct, it follows that grace at meals, a religious service at marriage, and the like, are not forms which may be carelessly observed or neglected at pleasure, but duties of the Christian life.

6. *the words of faith.*] Rather, **the faith**, the truths of the Gospel.

*hast attained.*] "Hast closely followed."

7. *But . . . profane*] "**The** profane and old wives' fables" now so rife. So Strabo speaks of "old wives' mythology," γραώδη μυθολογίαν. There is no ground whatever for inferring an allusion to the old universal Mother, the Sophia Achemoth, of later Gnosticism. These are the fables or myths mentioned in i. 4, and more fitted for old women than for ministers of the Gospel.

*exercise.*] "Train."

8. For the training of the body, on which so much importance was laid by the Greeks, is profitable for little: it has its uses, but they are comparatively unimportant. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24–27. Some refer the words to the ascetic practices just condemned; but the Apostle, in such a context, when his object was to warn against them, would hardly speak of them as profitable, even "for little:" while allusions to gymnastic training would be appropriate and significant in writing to Timothy, whose father was a Greek.

*promise of the life that now is.*] Perhaps "the promise of life," *i.e.* of all that life can give and is; "both of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." The promises of the old covenant," observes Bishop Ellicott, "are thus incorporated in the new and enhanced." But the *best* promises even of the present life are spiritual.

9. *This is a faithful saying.*] Here referring to the foregoing maxim. See on i. 15. There is nothing in what follows which has any appearance of a well-known phrase.

10. *For therefore.*] With a view to this promise of life, and its realisation in ourselves and others.

*we.*] Paul, Timothy, and all ministers of the Gospel.

Digitized by Google

in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.

11 These things command and teach.

12 Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.

13 Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.

14 Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by pro-

---

*specially.*] In the highest degree: most effectively. Potentially and in its purpose salvation is universal: for "God our Saviour will have all men to be saved," ii. 3, 4, and Jesus Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, 1 John ii. 2. But in effect it is limited by man's unbelief; for "he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark xvi. 16. And it is in order that all those of whom God is the Saviour may be effectually saved by belief of the Gospel that its ministers both toil and suffer reproach.

**12.** *Let no man despise thy youth.*] *I.e.* have reason to despise it. Timothy was probably at this time thirty-eight or forty, and therefore much younger than some of the presbyters or elders he had to govern. His youth had probably been before objected to him. See 1 Cor. xvi. 11.

*but be thou an example.*] Rather, **become.**

*in word.*] Both in public teaching and private converse.

*conversation.*] Rather **conduct**, the sense indeed in which the word conversation was used by our translators. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 12; Gal. i. 13; Eph. i. 3, iv. 22, &c.

*in spirit.*] These words are wanting in the best MSS.

**13.** *to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.*] The article in the Greek before each of these words would seem to define them as belonging to the offices of his ministry. "To the (or your) public reading of the Old Test. (2 Cor. iii. 13, 14), and possibly some of the New: (see Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27), to your exhortation to the duties of the Gospel, and to your teaching of its doctrines."

**14.** *Neglect not.*] By not employing it diligently to the end for which it was given. (Cf. 2 Tim. i. 6.)

*the gift.*] Charisma, used often by St. Paul, and once by St. Peter (1 Pet. iv. 10), a gift from the Holy Spirit, as proceeding from the grace, χάρις, the free, unearned mercy of God. See especially 1 Cor. xii. Here it is the special gift conferred on Timothy at his ordination to qualify him for, and to give effect to, the work of the ministry;—a gift which is invoked in our service for the Ordering of Priests, together with the laying on of hands of the Bishop and Presbytery, in the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God."

*which was given thee by prophecy.*] The revelation, probably, made to the Church or to some members of it, which designated Timothy as called to the ministerial office. See i. 18.

*with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.*] Or the body of the presbyters. So Acts xiii. 1–3, when the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of certain prophets, had designated Barnabas and Saul for separation for the work whereto He had called them, when they had fasted and prayed they "laid their hands on them."

The rite of imposition of hands, as at the same time designating for an office or duty and invoking a blessing or Divine gift for the due performance of it, is found in the Old Test. at the inauguration of Joshua, Num. xxvii. 18, 23; Deut. xxxiv. 9. Employed not only by the patriarchs, as in Gen. xlviii. 14, but by our Lord in imparting blessing, Matt. xix. 13, and in healing, Luke xiii. 13, it was continued in the Christian Church as the outward sign of the obsignation and imparting of spiritual gifts, whether of the miraculous powers which were granted to some believers in different degrees and kind, or of the strengthening grace which is needed by all who have been baptized, or of the special qualifications and powers bestowed for the discharge of any particular office or work in the Church. The "doctrine of laying on of hands" is enumerated in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 1, 2) among "the principles" or rudimental tenets "of the doctrine of Christ."

The Presbytery is here spoken of as an institution, a body united by brotherhood and discipline, not merely as a number of unconnected and independent Presbyters.

In his second Epistle (2 Tim. i. 6), St. Paul reminds Timothy of "the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands." The inference is that Timothy was ordained by the Apostle in the exercise of that function which was afterwards committed and confined to the chief officer of each Church, in the second century called distinctively the Bishop, together with the Presbyters. So in our Ordinal,

Digitized by Google

phecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.

15 Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear [1] to all.

[1] Or, *in all things.*

16 Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.

---

"the Bishop with the Priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the office of Priesthood." It is worthy, however, of observation that the ordination of Timothy was *by*, διὰ, the imposition of the hands of St. Paul (2 Tim. i. 6), and *with*, μετὰ, that of the Presbytery. The former was the instrument of Ordination; the latter an important and ordinary, but probably not an essential, concomitant.

It is not known where Timothy was ordained. Some suppose Ephesus; but it might be in any of the cities visited by St. Paul in which there were Presbyters enough to form a Presbytery.

**15.** *Meditate upon these things.*] Rather, **Let these things be thy care.**

*give thyself wholly to them.*] Literally, "*be* in them:" make them your life's employment. Compare the exhortation in the Form of Ordering Priests: "We have good hope that you have clearly determined to give yourselves wholly to this office . . . . so that . . . . you will apply yourselves wholly to this one thing."

*to all.*] The reading, "in all things," given in the margin from the received Greek Text, is not borne out by the best MSS.

---

## CHAPTER V.

1 *Rules to be observed in reproving.* 3 *Of widows.* 17 *Of elders.* 23 *A precept for Timothy's health.* 24 *Some men's sins go before unto judgment, and some men's do follow after.*

REBUKE not an elder, but intreat *him* as a father; *and* the younger men as brethren;

2 The elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity.

3 Honour widows that are widows indeed.

---

CHAP. V. 1—VI. 19. Miscellaneous directions for discipline and government of the Church and of the different classes in it.

V. **1.** *an elder.*] In age, not here a presbyter in office; though they would sometimes be coincident. Timothy was yet young (iv. 12).

**3–16.** Directions about Widows. This passage has caused, and probably will ever cause, much difference of opinion. One of the earliest cares of the Christian Church was the maintenance of widows out of its charitable funds; and the origin of the order of Deacons is assigned to a murmuring which arose among the Hellenistic believers against the Hebrew Christians, "because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration." Acts vi. 1. Similar provision would doubtless be made for these helpless members of the society wherever a church was founded; and directions might be needed to prevent any misapplication of charity in their case by admitting the claims of those who had children or relatives naturally responsible for their support. St. Paul therefore instructs Timothy (vv. 3–8) to honour with the alms of the Church only those who are "widows indeed," being destitute of relations on whom the duty of supporting them ought to rest, and themselves bearing a good character. At first sight it would seem, and indeed it is maintained by many, that the subject of the qualifications of those widows who are to be recipients of the alms of the Church is continued in vv. 9–16; but further consideration makes this view at least improbable. It would not be reasonable to exclude from the Church's alms destitute widows because they were not yet sixty years old, or had been twice married, or had never been in a condition of life to enable them to perform the acts of charity enumerated in v. 10. The abruptness, too, of the transition at v. 9, "Let not a woman be taken into the number" or list, without any particle to connect it with the preceding verse, rather looks like the passage to a new, however kindred, subject. At any rate it would seem that, besides the general body of widows who had a claim on the alms of the Church, and sometimes perhaps chosen out of them, was a list (catalogue) of widows having special qualifications and probably special duties. That there was an institution

Digitized by Google

4 But if any widow have children or nephews, let them learn first to shew [1]piety at home, and to requite their parents: for that is good and acceptable before God.

[1] Or, *kindness.*

5 Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day.

6 But she that liveth [1]in pleasure is dead while she liveth.

[1] Or, *delicately.*

7 And these things give in charge, that they may be blameless.

8 But if any provide not for his

---

of Ecclesiastical Widows in the early Church, at least in the second century and onwards till the Council of Laodicea, is apparent from Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom; and traces of the institution have even been supposed to be found in Hermas and Lucian. They were bound not to marry again; were set apart by imposition of hands; had a special place assigned them in the Church; and exercised some authority and superintendence over widows and orphans and probably other women. In this way the name Widows seems to have become an *official* designation, independent of the above qualifications; for Ignatius mentions "virgins who are called widows," and Tertullian, "a virgin under twenty years of age who was in the widowhood." It is not necessary to suppose that the institution was thus completely recognised in the Ephesian Church; but there would seem to have been, besides the poor widows who were relieved by the alms of the Church, a Catalogue or list of widows for which none were eligible who were under sixty years of age, had been married more than once, and had not distinguished themselves by acts of charity and hospitality. To these, as to the presbyters in v. 17, a special honorary maintenance was probably assigned, and on them special duties devolved. Whether such widows were identical with the deaconesses, as some suppose; or whether they performed in some churches the office which deaconesses discharged in others; or whether both institutions coexisted in the same church; are questions which the data we possess do not seem sufficient to solve.

**3–8.** Qualifications of individuals who are to receive relief.

**3.** *Honour.*] *I.e.* "Pay due regard to." The verb honour, as used here and probably in v. 17, for shewing respect by contributing to support or paying an allowance, not as a matter of right but of regard and good-will, has no equivalent in English. "Honorarium," as *e.g.* a physician's fee, conveys the same idea.

*widows indeed.*] *I.e.* desolate, as in v. 5; one who has no near relations on whom to depend.

**4.** *nephews.*] "**Descendants**," principally "grandchildren," for which the English word "nephews" was formerly used.

*let them.*] "Let her children and descendants first learn to show filial piety to their *own* family," which in this respect is nearer to them than the Church, "and to requite their progenitors," parents or grandparents, for the tender care bestowed upon themselves. Some early interpreters, as Chrysostom, the Vulgate, and a few modern commentators, make the subject of this clause "widows," implied in "any widow." "Let them first shew piety towards their own household, and requite their progenitors, now departed, by affection to their posterity." But besides that gratitude to progenitors is a far-fetched motive for obliging parents and grandparents to love and support their children and grandchildren—a duty which the law of nature and of God has already bound on them by far more powerful sanctions—the question here is the qualifications of widows to receive aid from the Church's alms; and she who is a widow indeed and desolate, is qualified, not because she has no children or grandchildren to support, but because she has none to support her.

*for that.*] *I.e.* the exercise of filial piety. The words "good and" are omitted in the best MSS.

**5.** *desolate.*] Without husband, children, or descendants.

*supplications and prayers.*] See on ii. 1.

*night and day.*] As did the widow Anna. Luke ii. 37.

**6.** *in pleasure.*] And extravagantly: the Greek word (σπαταλᾷν) combines the notion of luxurious self-indulgence with that of prodigality. (Trench, Syn.) Such a life destroys the spiritual life.

**8.** *But, &c.*] "But," to revert to the obligation of children and grandchildren, which indeed has a wider application,—"if **any one**"—not merely those within these closer relationships—"does not provide for his own" relatives, "and especially for those of his own household," his own immediate family, "he has denied the faith" practically, "and is" in this respect "worse than an unbeliever," who does, for the most part, perform these natural duties of domestic life.



Digitized by Google

own, and specially for those of his own [1] house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

[1] Or, *kindred.*

9 Let not a widow be [1] taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man,

[1] Or, *chosen.*

10 Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work.

11 But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry;

12 Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.

13 And withal they learn *to be* idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not.

14 I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary [1] to speak reproachfully.

[1] Gr. *for their railing.*

15 For some are already turned aside after Satan.

16 If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the church be charged; that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.

17 Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.

---

**9–15.** Qualifications of widows to be admitted into the class of Ecclesiastical Widows.

**9.** *number.*] "Catalogue" or list.

*wife of one man.*] "One husband"; neither having been divorced and married again, nor (probably) having remarried after the death of her first husband. (See on iii. 2.)

**10.** *if.*] "For example."

*she have brought up children.*] Those of others, especially orphans, besides her own.

*washed the saints' feet.*] Paid the kind offices of hospitality in an especial manner to Christians, as distinguished from "strangers."

**11.** *refuse.*] Decline, as disqualified to be placed on the list of ecclesiastical widows; although doubtless, if poor, they would not be excluded from relief.

**12.** *Having damnation.*] Incurring condemnation.

*their first faith.*] Or "promise;" the engagement they made, if not formally, at least virtually, when they were admitted on the roll of Widows, one of whose qualifications was, to have been the wife of one husband.

**13.** *And withal.*] Rather, **And at the same time too.**

*from house to house.*] Lit. "the houses" which it was their business to visit. As the duties of the Ecclesiastical Widows required them to visit the families of believers, it was necessary that they should be discreet, experienced and godly women, to prevent their visits from degenerating into idle gossip and tale-bearing.

The somewhat unusual construction, ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι, "they learn to be idle," is justified by Plato, Euthyd., οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν.

**14.** *the younger women.*] Rather, **widows**—see v. 11. The Greek has no substantive. When they wish it, the Apostle wills it, even though in his own judgment it may be preferable for a widow to remain single. See 1 Cor. vii. 8, 9.

*the adversary.*] The opponent of Christianity. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 12, 15.

**15.** *turned away after Satan.*] From sobriety and purity, and consequently perhaps from the faith. There was abundant time for the Apostle to have had experience of such melancholy declensions at Ephesus, or at any rate in other Churches; so that it is a feeble argument which infers from these words a date in the second century for this Epistle.

**16.** *If any man or woman that believeth.*] Some MSS. read only "if any woman:" but the received reading is preferable. Whichever is adopted, the sentence is an additional explanation referring to the whole subject of widows, and extends the duty of assisting them, instead of throwing their maintenance on the Church, from children and descendants (v. 4), to all relations and connexions, if believers, even if these be women and not themselves heads of families.

**17.** *Let the elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honour.*] Of greater regard than is paid to others, both in the reverence shown them and in the maintenance (honorarium) allotted to them. See on v. 3.

Digitized by Google

[a] Deut. 25. 4.
[b] Matt. 10. 10.
[1] Or, under.

18 For the scripture saith, [a]Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, [b]The labourer *is* worthy of his reward.

19 Against an elder receive not an accusation, but [1]before two or three witnesses.

20 Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.

21 I charge *thee* before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things [1]without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.

[1] Or, without prejudice.

22 Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure.

---

*especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.*] There is no emphasis in this place on "labour," as if in contradistinction to presbyters who are remiss; nor is it probable that (as Mosheim thinks) labouring in word and doctrine applies to those who are engaged in strictly missionary work, preaching the Gospel where it is not known. But it may be inferred from the passage, first, that there were, at this early time, some presbyters who ruled but did not teach; and, secondly, that both these and, in a higher degree, those who *also* taught, received maintenance from the congregation even from the first foundation of at least the Pauline Churches.

**18.** *the ox that treadeth out the corn.*] Rather and more literally, **an ox while threshing.**] The precept in Deut. xxv. 4 is one of humanity to animals. The ox, while treading out the corn with his hoofs or dragging the threshing-wain over it, was not to be prevented from helping himself as the reward of his labour. St. Paul, in an earlier Epistle, 1 Cor. ix. 9, had *argued* from this text the right of a minister to be maintained by those to whom he ministers: he here refers to it as *inferring* the right.

*And, The labourer is worthy of his reward.*] Rather, **hire**, as in Luke x. 7, where these words are used by our Lord. It is highly probable that St. Paul was acquainted with the Gospel of St. Luke, which was written before the Acts of the Apostles, and therefore in all likelihood before the termination of the Apostle's first imprisonment at Rome. But he may have been acquainted with the words as one of our Saviour's numerous sayings, which were repeated and taught by Evangelists before the "Gospels" were reduced to writing; or the quotation may possibly have been a national proverb used independently by our Lord and by St. Paul, the origin of which might be due to the precept in Deut. xxiv. 14, 15. In any case there is no weight in Baur's argument, who assigns the Epistle to the second century because St. Luke's Gospel is quoted as "Scripture." In all probability the words "the Scripture saith" refer only to the first quotation; and even if the latter clause is included, our Lord's words recorded by St. Luke may have been called Scripture by St. Paul, as St. Paul's own Epistles are by St. Peter—2 Pet. iii. 16.

**19.** *before two or three witnesses.*] Rather, **on the testimony of**: *i.e.* on the same amount of testimony as was required in other cases. See Deut. xix. 15.

**20.** *Them that sin.*] Perhaps not Presbyters only, but all.

**21.** *I charge thee.*] Solemnly.

*the Lord Jesus Christ.*] The words "the Lord" are not in the best MSS.

*the elect angels.*] The words are variously explained. It is perhaps best to understand them *generally*, the Holy Angels, God's special attendants. So nearly "elect" is used in 1 Pet. ii. 6, not so much to imply distinction as to express excellence. The elect saints are God's Church on earth; the elect angels are His court in heaven. They are appealed to here, as Bishop Bull observes, "because they in the future judgment shall be present as witnesses with their Lord." Serm. XII. (i. 315). Other interpretations are: 2. Those who kept their first estate, in contradistinction to the fallen angels. 3. The guardian angels of Timothy or of the Church of Ephesus. 4. Angels specially selected by God as His messengers to men.

*these things.*] These directions as to the accusation of presbyters and the open rebuke of those who sin.

*without preferring one before another.*] Better, **without prejudice**, as in the margin.

**22.** *Lay hands suddenly on no man.*] Rather, in accord with modern usage, **hastily**. This injunction is referred by Hammond, De Wette, Bp. Ellicott, and others, to the imposition of hands at the restoration of penitents to the Church by absolution, which, they argue, is supported by the context of vv. 20, 21, 24, 25. If so, it stands alone in the New Test.; nor is there anything in these four verses which reaches so far as to the idea of exclusion from the Church or excommunication. All the old commentators, and the great majority of modern, understand it of Ordination in con-



Digitized by Google

23 Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.

24 Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some *men* they follow after.

25 Likewise also the good works *of some* are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.

---

nexion with iv. 14 and 2 Tim. i. 6; and it is so applied in our Ember-week prayer, "that they may lay hands suddenly on no man." There is no real difficulty in the connexion of the injunction, thus explained, with the context. The same careful avoidance of prejudice or partiality on the one hand, the same observation of antecedents of reputation and character on the other, which are requisite in deciding on accusations, are still more essential in the approbation of candidates for the ministry; and in a very solemn sense does he who hastily ordains the unworthy make himself "partaker of other men's sins."

*keep thyself pure.*] With an emphasis on the personal pronoun, as especially becomes one who is to discern the character and to watch over and reprove the faults of others. But this precept does not imply a scrupulous asceticism: on the contrary.

23. *Drink no longer water.*] Rather, **Be no longer a water-drinker**, which Timothy had, perhaps, become, either in compliance with the best features of an ascetic tendency now developing, or as an example to the luxurious Greeks.

24, 25. Concluding cautionary rule both for the exercise of discipline, vv. 19–21, and for discretion in laying on of hands, v. 22.

24. *going before.*] Like heralds; "crying sins."

*to judgment.*] Or "decision;" so that in such cases there is little danger of mistake.

*they follow after.*] And therefore require investigation and caution.

25. *Likewise, &c.*] "In like manner too" (to take the other case) "their good works are manifest;" "and they that are otherwise," not manifest at first sight, "cannot be hid" on inquiry. The caution is directed against prejudice, ver. 21, and haste, ver. 22.

Some explain "judgment" of the judgment of God, when the secrets of all hearts will be disclosed; a sense in which the words are awfully true. But the thought is alien from the context, which consists of practical directions to Timothy.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *Of the duty of servants.* 3 *Not to have fellowship with newfangled teachers.* 6 *Godliness is great gain,* 10 *and love of money the root of all evil.* 11 *What Timothy is to fly, and what to follow,* 17 *and whereof to admonish the rich.* 20 *To keep the purity of true doctrine, and to avoid profane janglings.*

LET as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and *his* doctrine be not blasphemed.

2 And they that have believing masters, let them not despise *them*, because they are brethren; but rather do *them* service, because they are [1]faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.

[1] Or, *believing.*

---

CHAP. VI. 1. *Let as many servants as are under the yoke.*] Rather, **Let as many as are under the yoke, as bondsmen** or slaves. There is no stress on the words "under the yoke," as if they referred to the slaves of unbelieving masters, whose service was a yoke indeed; they rather strengthen the force of the term bondslaves. Slaves *are* under the yoke, and must be content to be so, whether their masters are believers or unbelievers.

*blasphemed.*] Rather, **evil spoken of.**

2. *but rather do them service &c.*] Rather, **but let them serve them the more, because they who are receivers of the benefit** (*i. e.* of their service) **are believers and beloved.** It is objected to the rendering that the service of slaves to their masters could hardly be called a benefit (εὐεργεσία); but Alford quotes a passage from Seneca (De Beneficiis, iii. 18), where he examines the question whether a slave can confer a benefit on his master, and answers it in the affirmative. And there is perhaps involved in the word "receivers" (οἱ ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι) the notion of *mutual* benefit, suggesting the food, shelter, raiment, which

Digitized by Google

3 If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness;

4 He is [1]proud, knowing nothing, but [1]doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,

[1] Or, *a fool.*
[1] Or, *sick.*

5 [1]Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

[1] Or, *Gallings one of another.*

6 But godliness with contentment is great gain.

7 For we brought nothing into *this* world, *and it is* certain we can carry nothing out.

8 And having food and raiment let us be therewith content.

9 But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and *into* many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.

10 For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have [1]erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

[1] Or, *been seduced.*

11 But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after right-

---

the slave in his turn receives. The only grammatical rendering is "because the receivers of the benefit are faithful (i.e. believers) and beloved;" and if it were the slaves themselves who were designated as receivers of the benefit—whether the benefit be (as Chrysost. and Grotius) the kindness of their masters, or (as Calvin and Bengel) the grace of God in redemption—it would be an argument, feeble from its very obviousness, that because they are believers and beloved, therefore they are to serve the more their believing masters. The danger which naturally attended the conversion of slaves to Christianity, that, feeling themselves thus called in the highest sense to an equality with their masters, they might neglect the duties of their station, or at least repine against it, is provided against in various passages of St. Paul's Epistles, 1 Cor. vii. 21–24; Eph. vi. 5–8; Col. iii. 22–24; Tit. ii. 9, 10.

**3.** *teach otherwise.*] "Is a teacher of other doctrines." See on i. 3.

**4.** *He is proud.*] "Lifted up with pride" (as iii. 6); inflated, or (as some translate) blinded, with pride.

*doting.*] Lit., "diseased," *i. e.* "morbidly anxious (with an allusion to "the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ") about questions and disputes of words."

**5.** *Perverse disputings.*] Rather, **stubborn contentions.** Our Version gives the correct translation of the received text, παραδιατριβαί; but the preferable reading is διαπαρατριβαί.

*that gain is godliness.*] Rather, **that godliness is a source of gain.** The words following, "From such withdraw thyself," are wanting in the best MSS.

**6.** *is great gain.*] **A great source of gain.** "There *is* a sense in which the sentiment of these men is true, if godliness is coupled with contentment instead of covetousness, and its gain measured not by this life only, but by eternity."

**7.** Cf. Job i. 21.

**8.** *raiment.*] Lit., "coverings," *i. e.* raiment and shelter.

*let us be, &c.*] Lit., **we shall be therewith content,** *i. e.* if we are reasonable.

**9.** *they that will be rich.*] "Who *wish* to be rich," make riches the object of their desire; for it is possible, as Chrysostom says, for one who has riches to employ them rightly while he sets no value on them.

*a snare.*] Probably "of the devil," as iii. 7.

*drown men in.*] Lit., "sink men in the depths of."

**10.** *the root.*] Rather, **a root.** One root, that is; there are many others. This passage, in connexion with ver. 7, appears to have been quoted from memory by Polycarp, ad Phil. iv.[1] "But the beginning of all difficulties is covetousness. Knowing then that we brought nothing into the world, and that neither have we anything to carry out, let us arm ourselves," &c.

*many sorrows.*] Such as anxieties, disappointments, desires, and pangs of conscience.

**11.** *O man of God.*] It is not clear whether this appellative is addressed to Timothy as a Christian or as a minister. In a very true

[1] Ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. Εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν, ὁπλισώμεθα, κ.τ.λ.

Digitized by Google

eousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.

12 Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.

13 I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and *before* Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good [1] confession;

[1] Or, *profession.*

14 That thou keep *this* commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ:

15 Which in his times he shall shew, *who is* the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;

16 Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom *be* honour and power everlasting. Amen.

---

sense all Christians should be men of God; but to Timothy, who from a child had known the Scriptures, the name would suggest the prophet who came to Bethel (1 Kings xiii. 1), Elijah and Ezekiel, and the lives and habits of these holy men, so opposed to covetousness and luxury.

*flee these things.*] Avarice and all the sins which grow from that root.

**12.** *the good fight of faith.*] Against the world, the flesh, and the devil; "grasp eternal life," the prize of the contest. Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.

*whereunto . . . also.*] *I.e.* to eternal life; **thou wast called, and didst confess that good confession** (of faith in Christ) **in the presence of many witnesses.** The tense of the verbs points to some special occasion which, though well known of course to Timothy, it is impossible to determine with certainty now. It might be his Ordination, or some time of trial and danger: but more probably his Baptism, when, as we know from Rufinus and others, from very early times, a public profession of faith was made. The Divine call and the confession of believers, observes Bengel, are correlatives: they imply each other.

**13.** "The Apostle having reminded Timothy of the confession of faith he made in the presence of many witnesses, now gives him charge, in the face of a more tremendous presence, not to disgrace it by failing to keep the commandment which the Gospel imposes on the Christian." Bp. Ellicott.

*quickeneth.*] "Giveth life to." Till the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. the weight of MSS. authority was decidedly in favour of another reading, "who keepeth alive" (ζωογονοῦντος in A. D. F. G., as against ζωοποιοῦντος in K. L.); but external evidence being now nearly balanced by the addition of ℵ, the context would seem to sustain the received reading. The reference is to the universal quickening at the resurrection, at the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ, when all fidelity and obedience will be tried, and the certainty of which, as held in God's hand, should be before every minister and every Christian as a motive.

*before Pontius Pilate.*] Or, "under," *i.e.* in the time of Pontius Pilate, as in the Creeds. Either translation is admissible. If the former is adopted, "his good confession" will be that narrated in John xviii. 33-37; if the latter, that witnessed by his life, teaching, and death.

**14.** *this commandment.*] Rather, **the** commandment; not to be referred probably to any one of the foregoing, but to the Gospel in general, as a precept of holy practice.

*without spot, &c.*] Some apply these adjectives to "thou:" *i.e.* that thou being without spot, &c.; but they are applicable to things as well as persons, and are almost necessary to complete the sense of "keep."

**15.** *in his times.*] **His own times**: ordained by Him, and known only to Him.

*the blessed, &c.*] These titles are applied to God the Son in Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16.

**16.** *Who only hath immortality.*] Essentially and underived, He being the essence and fount of all life. (John v. 26.)

*dwelling in, &c.*] More literally, **dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no one of men has seen nor is able to see.** Yet our Lord says of the pure in heart that "they shall see God," Matt. v. 8, and holiness is a condition "without which no man shall see the Lord," Heb. xii. 14. The word "see" must therefore be used in a different sense. Bishop Pearson distinguishes thus: God is invisible to the natural eye, both in man's natural and supernatural states, and to the intellectual eye in his natural state; but the invisibility of the Divine Essence does not prevent our clear *intellectual* vision of Him in our supernatural state. (*Opera Posth.* Lec. xii.

Digitized by Google

17 Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in [1]uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy;

18 That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, [2]willing to communicate;

19 Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.

20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

21 Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace *be* with thee. Amen.

¶ The first to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest city of Phrygia Pacatiana.

[1] Gr. *uncertainty of riches.*
[2] Or, *sociable.*

---

i. 118 seq.) It has been thought that vv. 15, 16 are part of an ecclesiastical hymn. See iii. 16.

**17.** *rich in this world.*] **The world that now is.** In opposition to those riches which the great King at His coming will show.

*trust in uncertain riches.*] Rather, with the margin, **set their hopes on the uncertainty of riches.**

*the living God.*] "Living" is wanting in the best MSS.

*to enjoy.*] But not to trust to.

**18.** *ready to distribute, willing to communicate.*] Rather, **free in giving, ready in sharing,** i. e. with others.

**19.** *Laying up in store.*] Lit., "laying up as treasure for themselves a good foundation."

*eternal life.*] Rather, **what is really life** (the true reading, τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς, instead of τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς), in opposition to what rich men *call* life. Cf. Luke xvi. 9 and Matt. vi. 19, 20.

**20.** *that which is committed to thy trust.*] The deposit, that is, of sound doctrine. It is not necessary that παραθήκη (the true reading, not παρακαταθήκη) should have precisely the same meaning here and in 2 Tim. i. 12 and 14. In each place it means a deposit; but of what, or where, and to whom entrusted, depends on the context. Here the words following prove by the contrast that it is the deposit of sound doctrine, which it had been entrusted to Timothy to keep and to teach.

*profane and vain babblings.*] So 2 Tim. ii. 16; and cf. "vain jangling" 1 Tim. i. 6.

*science.*] Rather, **the knowledge.** "The oppositions" were probably the attacks of those who were already beginning to arrogate to their teaching the name of Gnosis, Knowledge, and were introducing the different elements which afterwards made up the systems called Gnosticism. There is no necessity whatever to refer these antitheses (oppositions) to the oppositions of Light and Darkness, God and Matter, the Good and the Evil Principles, and the like, which were taught in the later systems of the Marcionites and others: a necessity on which great stress is laid by those who would treat the Pastoral Epistles as forgeries of the 2nd century. Even if the natural interpretation given above could be proved untenable, it is very probable that the Gnostic antitheses might have their prototypes already in the Apostle's time in the mystical Jewish teaching. It should never be forgotten that the process of the formation of Gnosticism must have been going on in the 1st century, although we have scarcely any documentary indications of the process beyond those which may be observed in the Apostolic writings. It seems certain that no Christian writer, whether personating St. Paul or not, would have used language respecting the blasphemous theories of Marcion as gentle as that which follows.

**21.** *Which some professing have erred.*] **Missed their mark** "concerning the faith."

The subscription here, as elsewhere, is destitute of authority, nor is the hypothesis on which it is framed probable.

Digitized by Google

# THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO

# TIMOTHY.

## CHAPTER I.

*1 Paul's love to Timothy, and the unfeigned faith which was in Timothy himself, his mother, and grandmother. 6 He is exhorted to stir up the gift of God which was in him, 8 to be stedfast, and patient in persecution, 13 and to persist in the form and truth of that doctrine which he had learned of him. 15 Phygellus and Hermogenes, and such like, are noted, and Onesiphorus is highly commended.*

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus.

2 To Timothy, *my* dearly beloved son: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

3 I thank God, whom I serve from *my* forefathers with pure conscience, that without ceasing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day;

4 Greatly desiring to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy;

5 When I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee,

---

CHAP. I. 1, 2. Address and Salutation.

**1.** *according to the promise.*] "*I.e.* an apostle in order to make known the promise."

**2.** *dearly beloved son.*] Some see in the change of expression from 1 Tim. i. 2, "my own true son," an alteration of the Apostle's feeling towards Timothy; less of confidence, more of affection. But a writer is not bound, nor likely, to use the same formula of sentiment in every letter. Timothy was St. Paul's own son in the faith, and he was also dearly beloved.

**3–5.** Thankful expression of affection, and of desire to see him.

The construction of these verses is a little doubtful. They may perhaps be best paraphrased thus: "I give thanks to God whom I worship from my forefathers in a pure conscience, as I have incessantly remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day, longing to see thee, when I remember thy tears at our parting, that I may be filled with joy when we meet again;—I give thanks to God, I say, when I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith which is in thee." The object of St. Paul's thanksgiving was Timothy's sincere faith, which was brought to his memory in his nightly and daily prayers. It has been supposed that it was in Asia, where St. Paul left Timothy, that he was arrested and sent a second time a prisoner to Rome. Hence especially Timothy's grief. See Bp. Wordsworth. But this, though not improbable, is but conjecture.

*serve.*] Rather, **worship.**

*my forefathers.*] Here "immediate progenitors" by whom the Apostle had been brought up in the worship of the one true God, as Timothy too had been by his mother and grandmother.

*pure conscience.*] See 1 Tim. iii. 9.

*which dwelt first.*] This *may* mean that Lois was the first of the family, and then Eunice, who embraced the *Christian* faith. But in Acts xvi. 1 Timothy is described as "the son of a certain woman, which was a Jewess and believed," or a "believing Jewess": and it would seem more probable that Timothy was converted to Christianity at least as early as his mother. The faith, then, which dwelt previously in his grandmother and mother would be the unfeigned faith in God and in all the promises of the Old Testament, which involved in germ and type the truths of the New. The Apostle is referring, not so much to the object of their faith, as to its quality: it was "unfeigned."

*I am persuaded that in thee also.*] *I.e.* that it dwells in thee also. This is the natural construction; and it is quite gratuitous to

Digitized by Google

which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also.

6 Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.

7 For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

8 Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God;

9 Who hath saved us, and called

---

suppose the Apostle doubtful of Timothy's faith, and to translate, "that it will dwell." Timothy may have been discouraged possibly by the imprisonment of St. Paul, but his faith was unfeigned.

**6-14.** Exhortation to earnestness, boldness, and fidelity in the discharge of his office.

**6.** *Wherefore.*] *I.e.* because I know thy faith to be sincere, even though it may be tried at present.

*that thou stir up.*] Kindle into a flame, as a fire in danger of smouldering out.

*the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.*] The special gift, τὸ χάρισμα (as in 1 Tim. iv. 14), bestowed by God on Timothy at his ordination, to qualify him for, and to give effect to, the work of the ministry, the outward sign of obsignation and imparting of which was the imposition of the hands of the Apostle, together with those of the body of the Presbyters. See on 1 Tim. iv. 14.

**7.** *For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, &c.*] For in the bestowal of this gift it is not the spirit of cowardice which God has given us, but "of power," opposed to the weakness involved in cowardice; "and of love," which is so far from implying timidity that true love makes even the timid brave; "and of a sound mind," rather **self-control**, which keeps "a constant rein on all the passions and desires" (Trench), and would thus keep in check timidity and undue despondency. Some take σωφρονισμοῦ ("sound mind") to signify here "correction" of others, Church discipline, a meaning which the word will bear, but which is out of harmony with the other two elements of the special gift here enumerated, both of which are personal graces, not official powers. It should be observed, however, that while the special bearing of the ministerial charisma on Timothy's immediate trial is thus indicated, it has, of course, a much deeper and far wider range, and should pervade, mould, and animate the whole character and conduct of every one ordained by the like imposition of hands to the work of the ministry.

**8.** *Be not thou therefore.*] Such being the character of the gift you have received.

*ashamed.*] As you may be tempted to be.

*of the testimony of our Lord.*] *I.e.* of bearing testimony, as an Evangelist, to the incarnation, life, death, resurrection, doctrine, and precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ. Cf. Acts i. 8: "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me."

*nor of me his prisoner.*] A prisoner indeed, but the Lord's prisoner, not only for His sake, but by His will.

*but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel.*] Rather, **suffer hardship with me for the Gospel**, *i.e.* the Gospel's sake.

*according to the power of God.*] Either. "in accordance with the power of His grace working in us and enabling us:" or, "in accordance with the power which He has displayed in saving us, and which will, no doubt, deliver us." The latter meaning seems more agreeable to the context which follows.

**9.** *Who saved us.*] All believers, *i.e.* not merely Paul and Timothy.

*and called us with a holy calling.*] St. Peter (1 Pet. i. 15) gives the full force of this epithet: "as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation."

*not acording to our works.*] Cf. Tit. iii. 5, "not by works of righteousness which we have done."

*but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.*] Rather, **but according to his own purpose, and the grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before eternal times**: before the times of ages back began to run their course (Calvin), *i.e.* from all eternity. So Rom. xvi. 25, which compare. To understand this as only "before the Jewish dispensation," or "before any of God's dispensations for fallen men," is to miss the great truth which so magnifies the love of God—His eternal purpose of the redemption of a race foreknown to be rebellious against His will. "Grace" here is that highest expression of God's free and undeserved mercy—His purpose to save us by Jesus Christ. It was *given* from all eternity, not merely promised; for what God purposes, *is.*

Digitized by Google

*us* with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,

10 But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel:

11 Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.

12 For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have [1]believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.

[1] Or, *trusted.*

13 Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me,

---

**10.** *But is now made manifest.*] Cf. Tit. ii. 11, "The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared."

*the appearing.*] Here and in Tit. ii. 11 the incarnation, life, and ministry "of our Saviour Jesus Christ:" elsewhere usually of His return in glory.

*who hath abolished death.*] Rather, **taken from death its power**, rendered it impotent. Death remains, the last enemy to be destroyed (1 Cor. xv. 26); but it has lost its sting (v. 55); and believers are delivered from its fear (Heb. ii. 14, 15).

*and hath brought life and immortality to light.*] Rather, **hath thrown light upon**, hath lit up man's true and endless life, and the incorruption of his whole being, body and soul. These were truths before, but indistinct and lost in gloom: but the Light of the world at his appearing shone upon them: and they stand out distinct as objects of faith and our "blessed hope."

*through the gospel.*] The instrumental means of making known the appearing of the Saviour, with all which He revealed.

**11.** *Whereunto.*] *I.e.* for the publication of which gospel.

*preacher,.. apostle,.. teacher.*] As if to fulfil to the Gentiles our Lord's triple commission (Matt. xxviii. 19): "go into all the world" as apostle; "make disciples of all nations" as preacher; "teaching them" as teacher, "to observe all things commanded you."

**12.** *For the which cause.*] As a preacher especially to the Gentiles. Acts xxii. 21; Eph. iii. 1.

*these things.*] Present bonds and imprisonment and impending death.

*whom I have believed.*] Rather, **in whom I have trusted**, *i.e.* God.

*that which I have committed unto him.*] Lit. "my deposit;" which may mean either that which God had entrusted to Paul, or that which Paul had entrusted to God. The former sense—implying either, 1, the Holy Spirit; or 2, the soul as a trust from God; or 3, (more probably) the faith which he was commissioned to preach; or 4, the apostolic office committed to him—has been thought to be rendered necessary by the use of the previous word "deposit," παραθήκη, in 1 Tim. vi. 20. But no writer is obliged to use the same word with exactly the same application in different contexts. Here the train of thought implied in "I know in whom I have trusted," leads much more naturally to the mention of the deposit which the Apostle had entrusted to God: *i.e.* not merely his soul, or his hopes, or his safety, specifically, but his whole self, body, soul, and spirit—all he is and all he is to be—which he had entrusted into the hands of God to keep, as to Him seemed best, "against that day," the day of the Lord's appearing again, when salvation will be complete, and hope will be merged in the certainty of bliss.

**13.** After the personal digression of the last two verses to which the mention of the power of God as manifested in the salvation of the world had (in accordance with his usual style and habit) led him, the Apostle returns to the precepts in 6-8. "While stirring up the gift which is in thee, and delivering the testimony of which you are not to be ashamed, you need be at no loss *how* to do it."

*Hold fast.*] Rather, **hold** or **keep**. The Greek ἔχε will hardly bear the strong words of our version. "You have a form of several words which thou hast heard of me," whether specifically a creed, or more generally the model of the Apostle's teaching—"have it still, keep it."

*in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.*] For even the soundest doctrine and the most accurate symbols avail not, if not held in the grasp of a "faith which worketh by love."

To consider "the form of sound words" to be the Apostle's preceding words in v. 12, as a formula which Timothy was to take as an example, ὑποτύπωσιν, is against the context and the opinion of all antiquity.

Digitized by Google

in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.

14 That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.

15 This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.

16 The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain:

17 But, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found *me*.

18 The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day: and in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou knowest very well.

---

**14.** *That good thing which was committed unto thee keep.*] Rather, **Guard that good deposit**, the deposit of a sound faith to be held by himself and taught to others. Here, as in 1 Tim. vi. 20, the true reading is παραθήκην, not παρακαταθήκην. "Paul," says Bengel, "when his departure was at hand, had two deposits; one to be committed to God, the other to Timothy."

*by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.*] Possibly the special charisma for the work of the ministry which was in Paul and Timothy by the laying on of hands. But the Holy Ghost dwells in all true Christians. Rom. viii. 9–11; 2 Cor. vi. 16.

**15.**—II. 26. Reference to some who had fallen away from the Apostle, or from the faith, and consequent exhortation and encouragement to Timothy to stedfastness, fidelity in teaching, and holiness of life.

*This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me.*] While St. Paul was encouraging Timothy, he was not himself without cause for depression. We know nothing of the circumstances alluded to nor of the persons named. The occurrences took place after the release of St. Paul from the imprisonment narrated in the Acts. St. Peter, who wrote to the Christians scattered in five provinces of Asia, alludes to persecutions to which they were exposed, and which might have caused the defection of which St. Paul complains. The words, "all they which are in Asia," *may* mean that all the converts now in Asia, who had lately been with him at Rome, had there deserted him in his day of trial; but they rather point to a large defection from the Apostle and his teaching on the part of the Christians in Asia, in the limited sense in which the name is used in Acts xvi. 6, xix. 10, for Proconsular Asia. That though large it was not universal, appears from the next verse.

*Phygellus.*] **Phygelus** in the best MSS.

**16.** *All* I said, yet not quite all; there are exceptions. There is the household of Onesiphorus: may God have mercy upon it and him!

*ashamed of my chain.*] A prisoner in free custody (libera custodia) was chained by *one* wrist to the soldier who kept him. See Acts xxviii. 16. This may be the explanation of the singular "chain," and a natural and undesigned coincidence between the epistle and the fact.

**17.** *But.*] **On the contrary**: "but" is here hardly strong enough.

*very diligently.*] Rather, **the more diligently**, *i.e.* from hearing that I was in bonds.

Bp. Pearson assuming that the greater diligence was rendered necessary by the greater severity of St. Paul's captivity, argues hence for the fact of a second captivity. Minor Works, ii. 383. See v. 9 and note. And see Introduction.

**18.** *of the Lord in that day.*] The day of the coming of the Lord.

"The Lord" thus repeated may be little more than the reciprocal pronoun "himself" a little emphasised (Bengel), especially if the expression "may the Lord" had become a formula of prayer and blessing. (Alford.) Or, 2, the sentence may be a prayer to God the Father that Onesiphorus may find mercy from the Son to whom is "committed all judgment" (John v. 22). Or, 3, a prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ that he may find mercy from God the Judge of all. The last is perhaps the most consonant with ver. 16.

*unto me.*] These words are not in the Greek, nor are they necessary. He had done many acts of good service to the saints there. The translation, "how fully he exercised the office of deacon there," is possible, but not probable.

*very well.*] Lit. "better," *i.e.* "than that I need tell thee."

It has been inferred from ver. 16 that Onesiphorus was now dead. It may be so: but the words only indicate that he was absent

Digitized by Google

from his family. He seems to have been very lately with St. Paul at Rome, and might be there still, or on his journey home. The further inference drawn by Roman Catholic commentators in favour of prayers for the dead, is not only very precarious, as Onesiphorus *might*, at any rate, be alive, but has no bearing on the Romish system of prayer for the deliverance of the souls of the departed out of Purgatory. St. Paul's prayer for Onesiphorus was, that he might find mercy at the day of the Lord's coming.

---

## CHAPTER II.

1 *He is exhorted again to constancy and perseverance, and to do the duty of a faithful servant of the Lord in dividing the word aright and staying profane and vain babblings.* 17 *Of Hymenæus and Philetus.* 19 *The foundation of the Lord is sure.* 22 *He is taught whereof to beware, and what to follow after, and in what sort the servant of the Lord ought to behave himself.*

THOU therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.

2 And the things that thou hast heard of me [1] among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.

3 Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

4 No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of *this* life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.

5 And if a man also strive for masteries, *yet* is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully.

[1] Or, *by*.

---

CHAP. II.—1. *Thou therefore.*] Since all in Asia, with some few exceptions, such as Onesiphorus and his family, have turned away from me, do thou the more, &c.

*be strong.*] **Be strengthened.** Perhaps "inwardly." Bp. Ellicott. Cf. Eph. vi. 10.

*in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.*] "Grace" has here been taken for the grace of the ministerial office, the Charisma in i. 6, or specifically for that of preaching the Word; but it is more probably the gift of sanctification of the whole man in his personal, as well as his ministerial, character: a gift which is only received and enjoyed *in*, *i. e.* in union with, Christ Jesus. John xv. 4, 5.

2. *among many witnesses.*] The witnesses have been explained to mean, 1. The congregations whom Timothy had heard St. Paul teach. 2. The other Apostles. 3. The martyrs. 4. (as by Mosheim) Timothy's fellow-scholars, who with him received St. Paul's instructions for the ministry. 5. But they are most probably the Presbyters and others present at Timothy's ordination, who heard the charge which St. Paul delivered to him, and could bear testimony to his acceptance of it; "not merely spectators of Timothy's instruction, but definite independent witnesses to the truth of the things taught." Dr. Vaughan.

*the same commit thou to faithful men.*] Not merely "believers" but "trustworthy." Whether this deposit (παραθήκη (i. 14) comprised in the verb παράθου, "commit thou") had as yet taken the specific form of a creed or formulary, it is not easy to say. Such symbols were certainly in use in the 2nd century. But the substance, at least, of the truths taught was to be preserved carefully and handed down faithfully.

3. *Thou therefore endure hardness.*] Rather, **suffer affliction with me: take thy share with me in suffering.** The true reading is Συγκακοπάθησον, not Σὺ οὖν κακοπάθησον, from which our version is made.

4. *that warreth.*] Rather, **serving as a soldier.**

*this life.*] Rather, "**life.** "This" is not in the Greek. Life's business and cares.

*hath chosen him.*] **Enrolled him.**

The immediate application of the figure is to Timothy as serving in his ministerial capacity in the host of the Church militant; but it has an equally close significance to every one who has been signed with the sign of the Cross, in token that he shall not be ashamed manfully to fight under Christ's banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue his faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end.

5. *strive for masteries.*] Rather, **strive as an athlete.** And not only is this so with the soldier; if one strives in the games, too, he is not crowned except he strive "lawfully," *i. e.* "in accordance with the rules," in the training and the preparation as well as in the actual contest.

Digitized by Google

[1] Or, *The husbandman, labouring first, must be partaker of the fruits.*

6 [1]The husbandman that laboureth must be first partaker of the fruits.

7 Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.

8 Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel:

9 Wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, *even* unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound.

10 Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.

11 *It is* a faithful saying: For if we be dead with *him*, we shall also live with *him:*

12 If we suffer, we shall also reign with *him:* if we deny *him*, he also will deny us:

13 If we believe not, *yet* he

---

**6.** *The husbandman, &c.*] "Or, to take another illustration: '**it is the husbandman who labours**'—not he who neglects his work—'**who must first partake of the fruits.**'" To collect the sum of these three illustrations: "Do thou take thy share with me in suffering; it is the law and condition of success. The soldier on duty must deny himself all the advantages and endearments of civil and domestic life; the athlete in the games must not hope the crown, unless he observes the stern laws of the training and the contest; that husbandman only who has endured the toil has a right to share the fruits." Verse 6, therefore, does not bear directly on the question of the maintenance of ministers, though it does so indirectly by sanctioning the principle that labour should qualify for reward.

**7.** *Consider what I say.*] *I.e.* What I mean by these figures. You are well able to do so, for, &c.

*and the Lord give thee.*] Rather, **for the Lord will give thee.** The preferable reading is δώσει, not δῴη.

**8.** *Remember, &c.*] "Bear in mind." The connexion seems to be: But with all its toils and sufferings the Gospel has also its stores of abounding consolation. The remembrance of the risen and victorious Saviour is the comfort and support of His ministers.

*of the seed of David.*] And therefore not only the promised Messiah, of the tribe of Judah, and descendant, according to prophecy, of the Jewish kings, but also man in the truth of our nature, and consequently, as risen from the dead, the firstfruits of the dead.

*my gospel.*] The Gospel which I preach. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 1. These words, which Timothy was to bear in mind, may, perhaps, be a clause of a creed or Church hymn. Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 17; Eph. v. 14.

**9.** *Wherein.*] *I.e.* in the preaching of which Gospel.

*evil doer.*] **Malefactor**, as the word is translated in Luke xxiii. 32.

*even unto bonds.*] Paul was probably treated much more severely than in his former imprisonment. Acts xxviii. 16, 30, 31.

*but the word of God is not bound.*] *I.e.* although they may bind *me*. Cf. Phil. i. 12–14. Here, however, the application is more general. While Paul is in prison at Rome, the Gospel is running its free course over the whole Roman world.

**10.** *I endure.*] Cheerfully, not merely passively, all things, bonds, sufferings, death. (Bp. Ellicott.)

*the elect.*] God's chosen ones, whether already in the Church, or to be called into it afterwards.

*that they may also.*] Rather, that they **also may**: they as well as we.

*with eternal glory.*] Far more, then, than a counterpoise to the sufferings of this present world. Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

**11.** *It is a faithful saying.*] See 1 Tim. i. 15. This passage has the appearance of a portion of a Church hymn, or at least of a well-known Christian maxim (originally, Dean Alford supposes the utterance of one speaking under the gift of "prophecy"). If it is so, the particle "for" in this verse, and probably the whole of the last clause of ver. 13, "for he cannot deny himself," are added by the Apostle in accommodating the "saying" to his argument.

*if we be dead with him.*] Rather, **died with him**, *i. e.* when at baptism we were baptised into His death, that we should walk in newness of life. See Rom. vi. 4, 5, 8; Col. ii. 12.

**12.** *suffer.*] *I.e.* with Him. See Rom. viii. 17. "If so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together;" and cf. Matt. xix. 27, 28.

*if we deny him, &c.*] Matt. x. 33.

**13.** *If we believe not.*] Rather, **are unfaithful.**

Digitized by Google

abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.

14 Of these things put *them* in remembrance, charging *them* before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, *but* to the subverting of the hearers.

15 Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

16 But shun profane *and* vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness.

17 And their word will eat as doth a [1]canker: of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus;

18 Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some.

19 Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth [1]sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his.

[1] Or, gangrene.

[1] Or, steady.

---

*he cannot.*] The best MSS. prefix **for.** "For deny himself he cannot."

**14.** *put them in remembrance.*] *I.e.* those to whom you minister, the faithful.

*charging them before the Lord.*] "Solemnly charging them in the presence of the Lord (so 1 Tim. v. 21) not to dispute about words (1 Tim. vi. 4) useful for nothing, tending to the subversion, the overthrow, rather than the edification or the building up, of the hearers."

Some good MSS. (A. C[1]), the Vulgate, Italic, and Æthiopic versions read λογομάχει in the imperative, "Dispute not," which would require a stop to be put after "the Lord." But besides that the weight of MSS. authority preponderates in favour of the common reading, the break is abrupt and less in accordance with the usage of St. Paul, who employs the formula διαμαρτύρομαι, "exhort solemnly" to introduce an exhortation in 1 Tim. v. 21.

**15.** *approved unto God.*] In contrast with one who on trial is found worthless.

*a workman that needeth not to be ashamed.*] Lit., "**a workman not ashamed.**" Cf. Phil. i. 20, "my earnest expectation and my hope that in nothing I shall be ashamed."

*rightly dividing the word of truth.*] Lit., "cutting straight." The figure has been very variously derived: from a priest dividing the victim, a steward distributing the bread or stores, a stonemason, a carpenter, a ploughman, a road-cutter. The last has been most frequently adopted. Perhaps they are right, who, like Huther and Alford, consider that the figure had become almost lost sight of in common usage, and that the word had come to mean little more than to "manage" or "administer."

**16.** *shun.*] Lit., "stand aloof from."

*profane.*] **Their** profane.

*Hymenæus and Philetus.*] Hymenæus is probably the same mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20. Of Philetus nothing more is known.

**18.** The resurrection of the body, always a difficulty in ancient modes of thought, was especially so to those who, with the Essenes amongst the Jews, the Neo-Platonicians, and most of the early sects which afterwards expanded into Gnosticism, had adopted the dualism of the East, and held matter to be evil—sometimes the evil Principle, or his embodiment. Hence they were ready to avail themselves of the other sense of resurrection, the rising of those who were baptized into Christ to newness of life (Rom. vi. 3, 5; Col. ii. 12); and they denied that any further resurrection was to be believed. This error had been early taught in the Corinthian Church. See 1 Cor. xv. 12.

**19.** *Nevertheless.*] Notwithstanding the overthrow of some.

*the foundation of God standeth sure.*] Rather, **God's firm foundation stands**: i.e. the Church, the "great house" of ver. 20, but here designated by its "foundation," because the antithesis is to the baseless fabrics of heresy. Other explanations have been: the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; the promises of God; the fidelity of God; Christ; the Christian faith; the election of God. But the context and the analogy of Eph. ii. 19–22 leave little doubt of the correctness of the first interpretation.

*having this seal.*] "This inscription engraved on it." See Zech. iii. 9; Rev. xxi. 14. The inscription is twofold: one clause touching the foreknowledge of God, "The Lord knoweth them that are his," cf. Num. xvi. 5; John x. 14; the other the obedience of man, "Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity;" and both must combine as the mark of every lively stone built on this foundatian. See Matt. vii. 23, "I never *knew* you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity;" words which were probably in the Apostle's mind.

*Christ.*] Rather, **the Lord.** The preferable reading is Κυρίου.

Digitized by Google

And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.

20 But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour.

21 If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, *and* prepared unto every good work.

22 Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.

23 But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes.

24 And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all *men*, apt to teach, [1]patient,

25 In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;

26 And *that* they may [1]recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are [1]taken captive by him at his will.

[1] Or, *forbearing.*

[1] Gr. *awake.*

[1] Gr. *taken alive.*

---

20. But though the foundation of the Church bears the stamp not only of God's decrees but of holiness, yet in it, as in every large house, there will be evil and imperfection mingled with the good.

*earth.*] **Earthenware.**

*and some to honour, and* (**but**) *some to dishonour.*] *I.e.* some for purposes of honour and state, some for trivial and common uses. So are there in God's Church two classes, though each admitting of degrees. Cf. Matt. xiii. 30, 47.

21. *If a man therefore purge himself from these.*] "If, then, any one shall have cleansed himself from these," *i.e.* from "the vessels to dishonour," just mentioned. This has been thought to be a precept not to hold communion with evil men in God's Church, or with those who err in fundamentals; but it is rather, perhaps, a direction to cleanse oneself out of the number and condition of those "vessels to dishonour" by personally abstaining from the evils either of faith or practice which defile them. Cf. Isaiah lii. 11; 2 Cor. vi. 17.

22. *but.*] As an instance of such abstinence, "the lusts of youth avoid." Timothy was still comparatively young (see 1 Tim. iv. 12); but youthful appetites and passions are not extinguished in middle life.

*follow.*] "Follow after," as 1 Tim. vi. 11.

23. *But foolish and unlearned questions.*] Rather, "**The** foolish and ignorant questions" which the false teachers (ver. 17) debate "avoid: knowing," as you do, "that they do gender strifes."

24. *patient.*] Rather, **forbearing,** as in the margin.

25. *oppose themselves.*] Or "are contending against him."

*peradventure.*] Rather, **perhaps at some time or other:** in His own good time.

*the acknowledging*] Rather, **the full knowledge** of the truth of the Gospel.

26. *And that they may recover themselves* (margin *awake*) *out of the snare of the devil.*] Rather, **And that they may wake up and escape out of the snare of the devil.** No one English expression will translate ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ. The verb implies to awake up to sobriety out of a state of intoxication, and ἐκ adds the idea of "so as to escape out of." The figure would seem to be that of one who had been taken captive in the sleep of inebriety, restored to his faculties, and thus enabled to free himself.

*who are taken captive by him at his will.*] Rather, perhaps, **who were taken captive by him according to the will of that evil one.** See additional note.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 26.

26. There is considerable difficulty in this clause. The two pronouns, *him* and *his*, are, in the Greek, the first the personal αὐτοῦ, the second the demonstrative ἐκείνου, which, therefore, it is thought, must—and no doubt usually would—refer to different persons. 1. Some therefore (as Wetstein and Bengel), explain "him" to be "the servant of God," ver. 24, and "*his* will" to be the will of God, i.e. "being captured by God's servant or minister, in accordance with God's will;" or, "so as thenceforth to do God's will." 2. Others (Aret., Estius) "taken captive by the devil according to God's will," i.e. so long as

Digitized by Google

God wills. 3. (Beza, Grotius, Hammond, Ellicott) "that they may return to soberness out of the snare of the devil, although taken captive by him, so as thereafter to do God's will." 4. The construction adopted above is that of our version and of the Vulgate, and is approved by De Wette, Alford, and many others. The demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος, the force of which is to isolate so as to fix attention, is used not only to distinguish, but to emphasise (*e.g.* "in that day," ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, *i.e.* "that great day," 2 Tim. iv. 8), and this both in a good sense, as ille, or in a bad sense as iste; and in this usage it does not stand in any such contrast to αὐτός as to denote, necessarily, a different person. The translation of our version, then, may not only be defended, but may be maintained, as the easiest and most probable. In such a context the mind of the writer would naturally emphasise the pronoun in repetition. "Not only taken captive by him, but taken captive according to the good pleasure of that most evil and wretched of beings." Bp. Ellicott considers it improbable that the Apostle should use the two pronouns for the same subject here, when a few verses below, iii. 9, he uses them correctly for different subjects. But that the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος is used correctly there for another person in its office of distinguishing, is no reason why it should not be used with equal correctness here in its office of emphasising.

## CHAPTER III.

1 *He advertiseth him of the times to come,* 6 *describeth the enemies of the truth,* 10 *propoundeth unto him his own example,* 16 *and commendeth the holy scriptures.*

THIS know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.

2 For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,

3 Without natural affection, trucebreakers, [1]false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,

4 Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;

5 Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

6 For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive

[1] Or, *makebates.*

CHAP. III. 1–9. Warning of evil times, evil teachers, and evil men, about to come, and already in the Church.

1. Such announcements as those in ii. 20, 26, must have fallen damp and disappointing on the expectations of many in the first ardour of the Gospel. Vessels for dishonour, even in God's house; captives taken by Satan at his will, even after the prince of this world had been triumphed over on the Cross; these were facts at variance, doubtless, with the expectations of many believers, but necessary to be known. The warning, therefore, continues.

*This know also.*] The verb in some good MSS. is in the plural, which might be accounted for by the impression in the writer's mind that the warning was needed by the whole community. The singular is, however, probably the correct reading.

*in the last days.*] The time of the Gospel dispensation, which is the last of the Divine dispensations, and is to continue till the consummation of all things. It is clear from ver. 5 that Timothy himself was living in them. See Acts ii. 17, and especially 1 John ii. 18, where the Apostle expressly says that "it is the last time," and that "we know that it is the last time," because "even now there are many antichrists." So here, "in the last days," during the Gospel kingdom, when perhaps they might be least expected, "perilous times will come."

2. *lovers of their own selves.*] Self-love seems to be placed first, as the root of all the rest.

*boasters, proud.*] The former vaunting their supposed superiority in words; the latter nourishing the belief of it in their hearts.

3. *trucebreakers.*] Rather, **implacable**; those who will not make a truce.

*despisers of those that are good.*] Rather, **haters** (lit., not lovers) **of the good**.

4. *heady.*] *I.e.* (as defined by Johnson) "rash;" precipitate, hasty, violent.

*highminded.*] Rather, **blinded** (or puffed up) **with pride**. See 1 Tim. iii. 6.

*but denying the power thereof.*] Lit., "having denied," *i.e.* although they have denied "its power."

The enumeration of vices in Rom. i. 29 seq. describes heathenism; this describes corrupt Christianity. Bp. Ellicott.

6. *silly women.*] In the Greek a dimi-

Digitized by Google

silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts,

7 Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

8 Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, [1]reprobate concerning the faith.

[1] Or, *of no judgment.*

9 But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all *men*, as their's also was.

10 But [1]thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, longsuffering, charity, patience,

[1] Or, *thou hast been a diligent follower of.*

11 Persecutions, afflictions, which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured: but out of *them* all the Lord delivered me.

12 Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.

13 But evil men and seducers shall

---

nutive, γυναικάρια, is used, denoting contempt.

*laden with sins.*] And thus easily led by any who promise them rest.

7. *Ever learning.*] From this or that teacher.

*the knowledge.*] The **full knowledge.**

It is clear that the Apostle is describing evils already existing. Irenæus and Epiphanius remark on the success of the Gnostics with women. "Deceiving the female sex, which is persuaded by them," says the latter (Hær. xxvi. 11). But to argue hence the late date of this Epistle and to place it in the second century, is to forget not only that the same character is found in many, if not most, heresies (as is remarked by Jerome, Epist. ad Ctesiphontem), but also that the elements which went to make up the Gnosticism of the second century were at work and developing in Apostolic times.

8. *Jannes and Jambres*, or, according to some MSS., Mambres, were the traditional names preserved among the Jews of the principal magicians of Pharaoh's court. See Exod. vii. 11, and notes. Origen states that St. Paul is quoting from an apocryphal book, called the Book of Jambres and Mambres; but of such a book there is no other trace. The tradition makes them the sons of Balaam, who foretold the birth of Moses, counselled the persecution of the Israelites, and were either drowned in the Red Sea or perished in the slaughter after the making of the golden calf. The name of Jannes occurs, as of a noted magician, in Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxx. 2, and in Apuleius, Apol. ii.; and they were mentioned, according to Eusebius (Præp. Evang. ix. 8), by Numenius of Apameia.

*men of corrupt minds.*] Both intellectually and morally.

9. *as their's also was.*] **"As also that of those men became,"** when tested by Moses. The resemblance of the case of the men to whom St. Paul alludes to that of the Egyptian magicians was in their opposition to the truth, in the complete exposure of their folly, and possibly (as Bp. Ellicott thinks) in the occult arts to which they alike pretended.

10-17. In contrast to the above, exhortation to Timothy grounded on his privileges, on the example of St. Paul which he had followed, and on the pious education which he had received.

10. *But thou.*] Unlike these men.

*hast fully known.*] Rather, **hast followed,** or **followedst.** The reading is doubtful, whether the perfect or the aorist. If the former, the sense is, "thou hast followed, and art following, the example of my doctrine," &c. If the latter, "thou didst follow, as a disciple," with perhaps the additional notion of "accompanying." The same word is translated in Luke i. 3, "having had perfect understanding;" where see note. Timothy, and perhaps Timothy only, had been almost constantly with St. Paul from his second missionary journey till the time when he was left by him at Ephesus. (Bp. Wordsworth.)

11. *at Antioch.*] In Pisidia, Acts xiii. 50. If writing to almost any one but Timothy, it would have been necessary to specify this; or the Syrian Antioch, being by far the best known, would have been understood.

*at Iconium, at Lystra.*] Acts xiv. 5, 19, xvi. 3. The coincidences of the Epistles with the Acts have been pointed out by Baur and De Wette as suspicious; what would the same writers have said if instead there had been discrepancies?

12. *Yea.*] It is the common lot; thou too must expect thy share.

*and all that will live godly.*] **All too who are minded**—whose will is—"to live godly."

*in Christ Jesus.*] "Out of whom there is no godliness." Bengel.

*shall suffer persecution.*] In the literal sense of persecution from without, this may be understood as referring to the then ex-



Digitized by Google

wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.

14 But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned *them;*

15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

16 All scripture *is* given by inspi-

---

isting situation of Christians. It does not predict outward persecution to all true piety. But, besides the trials of ridicule and contempt, from which godliness is not exempt even in the most peaceful times of the Church, there is a more perilous persecution within, whenever there is the will to live godly: the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the Tempter striving for the mastery.

13. *seducers.*] **Deceivers**; in the primary sense of the word, "enchanters." The term had acquired the general meaning of "deceivers," but it is not improbable that the practice of magic was used by some of the "evil men" alluded to. See Acts viii. 9, xix. 19. *Many* at Ephesus "who used curious arts" had burnt their books, but others doubtless used them still.

14. *knowing of whom thou hast learned them.*] The majority of the best MSS., including Codex Sinait., read "of whom," τίνων, in the plural, *i.e.* Lois and Eunice; but some critics (as Tisch. 2nd edition, and Ellicott) prefer the singular τίνος, as less likely, they think, to be an emendation. This would refer to St. Paul, from whom Timothy had heard the Gospel, as he had learned the Scriptures of the Old Testament from his mother and grandmother.

15. *And that from a child.*] Early infancy. The Rabbis mention five as the age at which Jewish children are to begin to read the law.

*the holy scriptures.*] The word γράμματα is used for "the holy scriptures" in this place only of the New Testament, though common in Josephus. Elsewhere it is either γραφή or γραφαί.

*which are able.*] In contrast with all other writings.

*to make thee wise unto salvation.*] With the following important limitation, however, "through faith which is in Christ Jesus." "Those Scriptures he granteth were able to make him wise unto salvation, but he addeth, through faith which is in Christ." Hooker, Eccl. Pol. i. 14. 4. These Scriptures, it will be observed, were those of the Old Testament, which could make wise only by teaching salvation through the Christ who was to come, as Hooker also points out. The passage is conclusive proof of the position in the seventh of our Thirty-nine Articles, "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind through Jesus Christ."

16. *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable.*] Rather, perhaps. **every Scripture**, *i.e.* passage or book of Scripture, **being inspired, is also profitable**. The word "Scripture," γραφή, is used fifty times in the New Testament, and is in all these places applied to the writings of the Old or New Testament, and to no other. It is clearly a technical word, and must have been so used and understood by St. Paul and by Timothy. Limited here by the context to the Scriptures which Timothy had learnt as a child, it can mean only the writings of the Old Testament; but when applied to writings of the New Testament, as it is by St. Peter to the Epistles of St. Paul (2 Peter iii. 15, 16), it of course carried with it, as belonging also to those books, all the attributes of inspiration, profitableness, and the like, which inhered in the word in its application to the Old Testament. Had St. Paul's Epistles not been inspired and also profitable, St. Peter would not have classed them with "the other scriptures."

"Scripture," γραφή, without the article, is always used for a passage, portion, or perhaps book, of the Sacred Writings, expressed more fully in Acts viii. 32, by "the place of the scripture," ἡ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς. It is so probably in the doubtful passage 2 Peter i. 20. When all the Sacred Writings are intended, it is "the Scripture," ἡ γραφή, or, more usually, "the Scriptures," αἱ γραφαί. "Every Scripture," then, *i.e.* every passage or book of the Scriptures, which is the accurate rendering of St. Paul's words, is as extensive in meaning as "all Scripture," and more precise.

*given by inspiration of God.*] Lit., "God-breathed." Cf. 2 Peter i. 21, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The word does not enable us to establish or to give the preference to any of the theories of the *mode* of inspiration, but it does seem (as Bp. Ellicott remarks) "fairly either to *assume* or to *enunciate*," according to the translation adopted (see below), "this vital truth: that every separate portion of

Digitized by Google

ration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

17 That the man of God may be perfect, [1]throughly furnished unto all good works.

[1] Or, *perfected.*

the Holy Book is inspired, and forms a living portion of a living and organic whole. While, on the one hand, this expression does not exclude such verbal errors, or, possibly, such trifling historical inaccuracies as *man's* spirit, even in its most exalted state, may not be wholly exempt from, and *human* transmission and transcription may have increased, it still does certainly assure us, on the other, that these writings, as we have them, are individually pervaded by God's Spirit, and warrants our belief that they are (in the words of Clement of Rome, ad Cor. i. 45), "the true utterances of the Holy Ghost,' and an assertion of the *full* inspiration of the Bible."

The difference of opinion as to the preferable translation of this passage is as old as Origen and Chrysostom. Two renderings are equally grammatical; and the choice, after all that has been written on the subject, can be determined only by the context. 1. "Every Scripture is inspired and profitable for instruction, &c." 2. "Every Scripture, being inspired" (as it is), "is also profitable for instruction, &c." The former, that of our own version, has the authority of Chrysostom, apparently, Greg. Nyssa, Estius, Calvin, De Wette, Conybeare, and Howson; the latter, that of Origen, Theodoret, Erasmus, Whitby, Hammond, Rosenmuller, Hutton, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, and the Syriac and Vulgate versions with that of Luther. Even the context is reconcilable with either translation. It is an exhortation to Timothy to continue steadfast in what he believes and teaches, grounded on the excellency and sufficiency for his own salvation and for all the exigencies of his ministry, of the Holy Scriptures which he had been taught as a child. It would not be unsuitable to the Apostle's purpose to *remind* Timothy that every such Scripture was inspired as well as adapted to be the instrument for every branch of the ministerial work. But it would, perhaps, be more natural, as the stress of the argument rests on the profitableness of the Scriptures, to *assume* their inspiration, of which Timothy, as well as Paul, was well assured, and on this to found their sufficiency for all the parts and duties of the ministry. For doctrinal purposes it is immaterial which construction is adopted. The testimony of the passage to the inspiration of all that was included under the name of Scripture, is at least as strong if its inspiration is *assumed*, as if it is *asserted.*

*for doctrine.*] Instruction in the truths and precepts of revealed religion.

*for reproof.*] Conviction either of error in doctrine or of viciousness of life.

*for correction.*] Restoration of the weak or erring to the right way.

*for instruction.*] Lit. "for the training which is in righteousness;" the teaching and exercising the believer in all the parts and duties of the Christian life. Thus, as Bishop Ellicott well enumerates the uses of Holy Scripture, it *teaches* the ignorant, *convicts* the evil and prejudiced, *corrects* the fallen and erring, and *trains in righteousness* all men, especially those that need bringing to fuller measures of perfection.

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *He exhorteth him to do his duty with all care and diligence,* 6 *certifieth him of the nearness of his death,* 9 *willeth him to come speedily unto him, and to bring Marcus with him, and certain other things which he wrote for,* 14 *warneth him to beware of Alexander the smith,* 16 *informeth him what had befallen him at his first answering,* 19 *and soon after he concludeth.*

I CHARGE *thee* therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;

CHAP. IV. 1-8. Further exhortation to ministerial diligence enforced by the imminence of a love of error and by the nearness of the Apostle's own death.

1-2. *I charge thee.*] Such being the importance and efficacy of Holy Scripture "**I solemnly adjure thee.**" "Therefore," οὖν ἐγώ, is wanting in the best MSS.

*before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, &c.*] Rather, **before God and Christ Jesus, who will hereafter judge the quick and dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom, preach the word.** The best MSS. omit the words, "the Lord," τοῦ κυρίου; and instead of "*at* his appearing," κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ, read *and* his appearing, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ. The Apostle in his



Digitized by Google

2 Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.

3 For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears;

4 And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.

5 But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, [1]make full proof of thy ministry.

[1] Or, fulfil.

6 For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.

7 I have fought a good fight, I

---

solemn adjuration to Timothy to proclaim the word, as a herald, before the Lord's second coming, calls to witness God and the great Judge of *all* men, as well those who have died before as of those who will be alive at His coming; and the glorious advent itself; and the kingdom which it will bring in and establish; thus placing all before him as a motive to diligence and faithfulness.

*be instant.*] Attentive and earnest. Some (as De Wette, Hutton) translate "Go to (them)," *i.e.* to their assemblies; a meaning which the word would bear, but which is not only frigid, but would require to be made definite by the addition of "the brethren," "them," or the like.

*in season, out of season.*] Take opportunity or make it. Cf. Ezek. ii. 5, "whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." The application of this precept would of course be prudentially modified by such cautions as Matt. vii. 6.

*reprove, rebuke, exhort.*] Rather, **convict**, rebuke, &c.; put, that is, to its various uses every scripture which God has inspired, iii. 16.

*with all long-suffering and doctrine.*] Rather, **with all** (*i.e.* with unwearied) **patience and teaching.**

**3.** Two further reasons are added; the approach of a season when sound doctrine would be endangered by false teaching, and the Apostle's impending death.

*sound doctrine.*] Rather, **the** sound doctrine; which in these Epistles stands opposed especially to those false principles and myths which were gathering around into the more systematic forms of Gnosticism.

*but after their own lusts.*] *I.e.* in accordance with their own individual desires and passions. A corrupt will ever chooses its own doctrine

*having.*] *I.e.* "because they have itching ears," a prurient longing for novelty and excitement.

**5.** *But watch thou in all things.*] "But thou, be thou watchful, and sober in all things." The Greek verb νῆφε includes both meanings, and cannot, at least in the present context, be adequately translated by either alone.

*do the work of an evangelist.*] Not here the specific work of the office so called, but the work of proclaiming the Gospel (v. 2), which was still incumbent on Timothy in his higher position, and which, in fact, inheres, whatever else may be added to it, in every order of the ministry. Compare the stress laid upon preaching and "spreading abroad the Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation," in our Form of Consecrating a Bishop.

*make full proof of.*] *I.e.* perform fully.

**6.** It is for *you* to do this; for as for me, life's last sacrifice is now beginning.

*I am now ready to be offered.*] Rather, **I am already being offered.** Literally, "I am already being poured out as a libation," in allusion to the wine or drink offering poured by the Jews about the altar, and by heathens on the victim, at the sacrifice. Cf. Phil. ii. 17, "Yea, and if I be offered," poured out as a libation, "upon the sacrifice and service of your faith." Prof. Lightfoot cites the words of the dying Seneca, recorded by Tacitus, Ann. xv. 64, "respergens proximos servorum, addita voce libare se liquorem illum Jovi liberatori."

*my departure.*] From this life and its trials and duties. Elsner sees here an allusion to the breaking up and departure of guests from a feast; and the verb ἀναλύσῃ is used in Luke xii. 36, "when he shall *return* from the wedding." Wordsworth suggests the idea of a ship loosing anchor on her voyage to the harbour of eternal rest. But these are illustrations suggested by, rather than belonging to, the simple meaning of "the season of my leaving or departing." Cf. Phil. i. 23, where St. Paul employs the verb, ἀναλῦσαι. He then desired to *depart*, but felt a confident persuasion that he was to remain and work: now the time of his departure is at hand. It is the language of the same man under different conditions.

**7.** *I have fought a good fight.*] This is perhaps too specific: the figure includes all, or

Digitized by Google

have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith:

8 Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

9 Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me:

10 For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia.

11 Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.

12 And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.

13 The cloke that I left at Troas

---

any of, the contests in the games. "I have striven the good strife." Ellicott. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 25, where, as here, the general idea is further illustrated by the specific instance of the foot-race.

*I have finished my course.*] *I.e.* "the race," not of my life only, but of my ministry. Compare the Apostle's words in Acts xx. 24, and observe the harmony between his hopes there and their fulfilment here. The whole passage is eminently Pauline. May not the word here used "finished," τετέλεκα, be a reminiscence of the last words of the Saviour on the cross, as recorded by St. John (xix. 28, 30), τετέλεσται, "it is finished?"

*I have kept the faith.*] As a precious deposit which was committed to me. See 1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 20.

8. *a crown of righteousness.*] Rather, **the** crown of righteousness; the crown, that is, which shall be given for righteousness: as in the games, the crown of the race, the crown of wrestling, is the crown given to the victor in the race, or in wrestling, or the like.

*at that day.*] *I.e.* "in that great day," the day of account.

*that love.*] In the full meaning of the tense, ἠγαπηκόσιν, "have loved and are still loving his appearing." A touchstone, says Leo, by which to examine our hearts.

It is a criticism based on ignorance of the facts of the inner life, which sees in this happy confidence of the Apostle a contradiction to the humility of his other Epistles: *e.g.* Phil. iii. 12–14. Rather it is an evidence of the authenticity of this his latest Epistle, written when martyrdom was imminent. For it is a truth, proved by so many instances as almost to indicate a law of the procedure of the divine grace, that the assurance which has been withheld from God's people in the midst of their ordinary duties and trials, is granted them in the hour of need, and especially at the approach of death. Nor is there any contradiction between the Apostle's expectation of the crown of righteousness and his doctrine of free justification by faith. "Rather," says Calvin, "do these two rightly agree; that man is justified freely by the merits (beneficio) of Christ, and yet that he will receive the reward of works from before (coram) God. For as soon as God receives us into his favour, he holds our works also acceptable, so as to vouchsafe them a reward also, however undeserved."

9–22. Conclusion: miscellaneous requests, information, and greetings.

10. *Demas hath forsaken me, &c.*] Rather, **Demas left me because he loved the present world and went to Thessalonica,** which was perhaps his home. He was with St. Paul at Rome during part, at least, of his first imprisonment, being mentioned as joining in greetings to the Colossians (Col. iv. 4); and in the Epistle to Philemon (24) he is numbered among the Apostle's fellow-labourers. There is no scriptural ground for assuming that this shrinking from danger and duty, sinful though it was, was equivalent to, or ended in, total apostasy, which, however, was the later tradition mentioned by Epiphanius. Demas is perhaps a shortened form of Demetrius.

*Crescens to Galatia.*] Eusebius (H. E. iii. 4), Epiphanius (adv. Hær. ii. 1), perhaps Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret, explain Galatia here of European Gaul; and the Churches of Vienne and Mayence claimed Crescens as their founder. It is more commonly understood of the Asiatic Galatia. Nothing more is known of Crescens.

*Titus unto Dalmatia.*] A district on the east coast of the Adriatic, and at this time included in the Roman Province of Illyricum. In Dalmatia Titus would be in the neighbourhood of Nicopolis in Epirus, where probably St. Paul (Tit. iii. 12) desired him, under certain circumstances, to meet him.

11. *Only Luke is with me.*] *I.e.* Luke alone of the Apostle's usual companions in travel. Others were with him, ver. 23.

*for the ministry.*] The word had not yet become limited to a technical meaning, and

Digitized by Google

with Carpus, when thou comest, bring *with thee*, and the books, *but* especially the parchments.

14 Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works:

15 Of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood [1]our words.

16 At my first answer no man stood with me, but all *men* forsook me: *I pray God* that it may not be laid to their charge.

[1] Or, *our preachings.*

---

*may* include ministering to the Apostle as well as ministering the word.

For Luke and Mark, see the Introduction to their Gospels.

**12.** Having mentioned his solitude and the desertion of Demas, St. Paul accounts in this verse and in v. 20 for the absence of others of his fellow-labourers.

*And Tychicus.*] Rather, **but** Tychicus, who *was* also profitable for the ministry.

*have I sent to Ephesus.*] Rather, **I sent** to Ephesus, *i.e.* "as you know." These words afford no proof that Timothy could not now be at Ephesus. The apostle is not informing Timothy, but accounting for the fact that he is left alone. He *may* have been sent as bearer of the first Epistle. Some, however, as Weischer and Wordsworth, take the verb, "have I sent," ἀπέστειλα, as the epistolary aorist, which the Greeks used, as the Latins did the imperfect, where we use the present, placing themselves in point of time in the position of the receiver, instead of the writer of the letter. "Tychicus I am sending to Ephesus." And this is certainly possible. Tychicus appears to have been a native of some place in Proconsular Asia (Acts xx. 4). We find him together with Trophimus, also of Asia, among the party who accompanied St. Paul when he commenced his journey from Macedonia to Jerusalem. He may, however, have been left on the way; and he is not named with Trophimus, when St. Paul was accused of bringing Greeks into the Temple (Acts xxi. 29). He was again with St. Paul at Rome at his first imprisonment, and was sent by him with Onesimus to Colosse, with the commendation that he was a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord. He was also commissioned, probably, at the same time, to go to Ephesus, and was the bearer of the Epistles to both these Churches. There is a tradition that he became Bishop of Chalcedon.

**13.** *The cloke.*] The cloke, τὸν φαινόλην, or better, perhaps, φενόλην, was most likely the Latin pænula, a thick upper garment which the approach of winter (v. 21) would make desirable. It has, however, been doubted as early as by Chrysostom, whether the word does not mean a bag or case, perhaps to hold the books.

*the books*] Probably written on papyrus rolls, and so distinguished from "the parchments." What the books or parchments were must remain merely conjecture; though the latter doubtless contained writing. Plain parchment might be obtained at Rome. They *may* have been some books of Holy Scripture, which Josephus says were inscribed on parchment. The prepared leather, however, on which the sacred books were written for the use of the synagogues had the hair on one side preserved.

Nothing is known of Carpus; but it may be inferred from this passage that St. Paul had been lately at Troas.

**14.** *Alexander the coppersmith.*] Better perhaps "the smith," as the word χαλκεύς was used generically. If this Alexander is the same with him who is mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, where he is coupled with Hymenæus, he was an heretic and probably an heretical teacher (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18), as well as a personal opponent of St. Paul.

*the Lord reward him.*] Probably, **the Lord will reward him.** It is doubtful whether the reading is the optative, ἀποδώη, or the future indicative, ἀποδώσει. The latter has the support of the best and earliest MSS., but may be liable to the suspicion of being substituted for doctrinal reasons to avoid the appearance of an uncharitable prayer. The former is the reading of the great majority of later MSS and versions. The future seems on the whole the best supported; but the optative, as in our version, would not be the expression of personal animosity, but of zeal for the truth. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 21, 22; Gal. v. 12. The Apostle's *personal* feelings appear in ver. 16.

**16.** *stood with me.*] Stood forward with me to assist me by advocacy or advice.

The "first answer" has been supposed to mean, 1. The defence made at Cæsarea, Acts xxv. 17 seq., which is in the highest degree improbable. 2. The defence alluded to in Phil. i. 7, during the Apostle's first imprisonment at Rome; at which time, however, Timothy was probably with him, and would not require the information here given. 3. A defence made at Ephesus, at which Alexander had "withstood his words.' But Alexander appears rather as an heretical teacher than as an accuser or public prosecutor; and there is no hint else-

Digitized by Google

17 Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and *that* all the Gentiles might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.

18 And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve *me* unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.

19 Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus.

20 Erastus abode at Corinth: but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.

---

where of any imprisonment or trial at Ephesus. This explanation seems due only to a desire to connect this verse with the foregoing 4. A previous defence at Rome during his present imprisonment with reference to another which was impending or expected. If the words may be taken technically, the "first defence" might be on the first hearing, or "actio prima," after which, if the judge was not satisfied, came an adjournment, "ampliatio." The accused were usually assisted at their trial by an advocate who gave advice, and an "orator" or "patronus" who made the speech for his client. None such stood with Paul. But he was not alone: the tried believer never is alone.

**17.** *strengthened me.*] Perhaps "supplied me with inward strength," ἐνεδυνάμωσέ με.

*that . . . the preaching might be fully known.*] Rather, "that the preaching, the proclamation of the Gospel, might be **fully performed.**" If the "first answer," in v. 16, is understood of his defence at Cæsarea, or at Rome during his first imprisonment, or at Ephesus, these words would imply that the Lord thus preserved him in order that he might complete his mission to the Gentiles; a sense which would not be consistent with the circumstances of his last imprisonment, and his persuasion that the time of his departure was at hand. But, on the other hand, to proclaim the Gospel in this, his last trial, in the metropolis of the world, in its courts of justice and before its highest magistrates, was, in fact, the full performance and completion of the mission of him who was a "chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentiles and kings," Acts ix. 15.

*out of the mouth of the lion.*] This was so proverbial an expression among Jews for any great and imminent danger, that it is unnecessary to find in it an allusion to Nero, or to Helius Cæsareanus whom Nero left with extraordinary powers in Italy while he was in Greece, or to the principal accuser at the Apostle's trial, or to the devil. Cf. Ps. xxii. 13, 21, xxxv. 17, lvii. 4.

**18.** *And the Lord.*] **The Lord:** "and" is wanting in the best MSS.

*every evil work.*] Not here "from sin," but "from all the evils which the devil or man worketh against me," so that they shall do no real or lasting harm. It is faith's application of the petition, "deliver us from evil," in which the same Greek words occur, ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. So here, ῥύσεταί με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ.

*will preserve me unto.*] *I.e.* "will bring me safe into." This is not the expression of the Apostle's belief that he will be delivered from the Roman courts and from death, but that He who had saved him from the lesser danger, would save him through *all* evil, even to the completion of his salvation in heaven.

*to whom be glory.*] **The** glory. If the beginning of this verse is a reminiscence of the Lord's Prayer, it seems not improbable that this ascription of praise is so also; in which case the doxology must have been added in very early times to the petitions of that prayer. See on Matt. vi. 13. It is to be observed, however, that the ascription is *here* to Christ.

**19.** For Prisca, or Priscilla, and Aquila of Pontus, see on Acts xviii. 2: and for the household of Onesiphorus, see on 2 Tim. i. 16.

**20.** *Erastus abode at Corinth.*] Which was his home, if this Erastus was the same with the chamberlain or treasurer (œconomus) of the city whose salutation St. Paul sends from Corinth to the Roman Christians, (Rom. xvi. 23.) There was one Erastus with St. Paul at Ephesus (Acts xix. 22), whom he sent thence with Timothy into Macedonia. Whether this was the same person is uncertain.

*but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.*] Rather, **I left at Miletus.** Miletum is an error, perhaps a misprint. It is very difficult to suppose any point in St. Paul's previous history at which he could have left Trophimus at Miletus, excepting on the assumption of a second imprisonment at Rome, and a visit to Miletus or its neighbourhood in the interval between the two imprisonments Trophimus was an Ephesian (Acts xxi. 29). St. Paul may have alluded here to his illness, lest it should be inferred, from vv. 10, 11, that he too had deserted him.

For Trophimus see Acts xx. 4.

Digitized by Google

21 Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren.

22 The Lord Jesus Christ *be* with thy spirit. Grace *be* with you. Amen.

¶ The second *epistle* unto Timotheus, ordained the first bishop of the church of the Ephesians, was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time.

---

21. *before winter.*] When travelling would be dangerous or difficult.

*Eubulus* is mentioned here only. It has been thought possible that *Pudens* may be the friend of the poet Martial, whose marriage with Claudia, a foreign lady, he celebrates in Epigram viii. lib. iv., supposing that other epigrams which are not favourable to the moral character of Pudens were written before his conversion. An inscription found at Colchester mentions a site given by one Pudens for a temple built under the sanction of a British king, Claudius Cogidubnus; and it has been conjectured that this was the same Pudens who was a centurion in the army, and who may have married the daughter of Cogidubnus, whose name would consequently have been Claudia. The Claudia Rufina of Martial was a Briton (xi. 53), and may have received the name of Rufina from Pomponia, the wife of Aulus Plautius, commander in Britain, who was connected with the Rufi family, and was accused of holding foreign superstitions. All this, however, is very uncertain.

Linus is probably the same Roman Christian who became the first Bishop of the Church there, according to Irenæus iii. 3, and Eusebius, iii. 2.

22. The salutation is twofold: to Timothy and to his flock. "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. Grace be with you" (all).

The subscription, though in this instance probably correct, has no authority.

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO

# TITUS.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *For what end Titus was left in Crete.* 6 *How they that are to be chosen ministers ought to be qualified.* 11 *The mouths of evil teachers to be stopped:* 12 *and what manner of men they be.*

PAUL, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness;

2 [1]In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;

3 But hath in due times manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour;

4 To Titus, *mine* own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father

[1] Or, *For.*

---

CHAP. I. 1–4. Address and salutation.

**1.** *Paul, a servant of God.*] The only place in which the Apostle uses this designation, which is therefore very unlikely to have been adopted by a forger or imitator.

*according to the faith of God's elect.*] Rather, **for** the faith of God's elect: the faith of God's chosen ones, whether converted as yet or not, was the object and end for which Paul was sent.

*and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness.*] Rather, **and the full knowledge of the truth which is in accordance with godliness**, or, as some prefer, "tends towards godliness."

**2.** *before the world began.*] Lit. "before the eternal times," as 2 Tim. i. 9, which see. The promise of eternal life was included in the eternal purpose of God, though it was not revealed till after the creation of man in time and in the various dispensations granted to him. The rendering, "before very ancient times" (*i.e.* as Calvin paraphrases it, "the many ages which had passed since salvation was promised"), appears a doubtful translation of the Greek, is needlessly at variance with St. Paul's usages in 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 11, and gives a frigid sense.

**3.** *in due times.*] Lit. "**his own times**," *i.e.* his own appointed times, and therefore fit and "due" because appointed by him. Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 6.

*his word.*] Is here equivalent to, and substituted for, the promise of eternal life; *i.e.* the Gospel; as usually in St. Paul. See *e.g.* 2 Cor. iv. 2; Col. i. 25; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 9. Jerome, Augustin, and some modern commentators understand the personal Word, the second Person of the blessed Trinity. "Manifested," it is argued, can be said only of something pre-existing. But the promise of eternal life *is* considered by the Apostle as existing in God's counsels before the world began. It is also said, that the verb to "manifest," φανερόω, is specially applied, and almost consecrated, in Scripture to the manifestation of the Godhead in the Incarnation; as 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 20; 1 John i. 2. But the word is used by St. Paul still oftener in other connexions: *e.g.* "Making manifest the savour of his knowledge," 2 Cor. ii. 14. "That the life of Jesus might be made manifest in our body"—"might be made manifest in our mortal flesh," 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11. "That our care might appear" (lit. "be made manifest") "in you," 2 Cor. vii. 12. The connexion of thought here is just as it is in Eph. iii. 1–10. God's purposes and promises of grace, conceived in his eternal counsels, hitherto concealed more or less entirely—"mysteries"—are now manifested; and mainly by the instrumentality of the preaching which was committed, among others, to St. Paul.

*God our Saviour.*] Rather, **our Saviour God**. See on 1 Tim. i. 1.

**4.** *mine own son, &c.*] See 1 Tim. i. 2. Instead of "in the faith," we have here "after,"

Digitized by Google

and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.

5 For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are [1]wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee:

[1] Or, *left undone.*

6 If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly.

7 For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not [a]given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre;

[a] 1 Tim. 3. 3.

8 But a lover of hospitality, a lover of [1]good men, sober, just, holy, temperate;

[1] Or, *good things.*

9 Holding fast the faithful word [1]as he hath been taught, that he may

[1] Or, *in teaching.*

---

*i.e.* according to "the common faith," the faith common to both, and in the bonds of which stood Titus's filial relationship to St. Paul. Some explain "common to all men," or "common to Gentile and Jew," Titus being a Greek.

5–9. Reason for leaving Titus in Crete, and qualifications of the Presbyters whom he was to ordain.

5. *For this cause left I thee in Crete.*] For Crete, the southernmost island of the Grecian Archipelago, see note on Acts xxvii. 7. There is no *record* of any visit of St. Paul to Crete excepting the one there narrated. He *may* have gone there from Ephesus or Corinth during the period of his life embraced in the Acts; but it is far more probable that the visit referred to in the text took place after his first imprisonment at Rome. See Introduction. This island, although famous in the mythology of early Greece, had played no important part in its subsequent history. It had been added to the Roman Empire by Metellus (B.C. 67), and was united in one province with Cyrenaica on the African coast. There are indications of considerable Jewish settlements on this island. Tacitus, indeed, mentions among several traditions of the origin of the Jews, that they came from Crete; perhaps from a confusion between them and the Cherethites or Cherethim, who are supposed to have been Philistine mercenaries. The Septuagint translates these names by Cretans in Ezek. xxv. 15; Zeph. ii. 5, where, too, in v. 6, for "sea-coast" it reads Crete. Jews in Gortyna, a city of Crete, are alluded to in 1 Mac. xv. 23. Josephus mentions the Jews in Crete in connexion with Alexander, the pretended son of Herod (*de Bell. Jud.* ii. 7, s. 1); and Philo, in the reign of Caligula, speaks of Crete as being, like other islands of the Mediterranean, full of Jews. (*Leg. ad Cæs.* xxxvi.) Cretes were among the devout Jews who were sojourning at Jerusalem at the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 11. When, or by whom, Christianity was planted on this island, is quite uncertain. It could hardly have been by St. Paul, unless we suppose some visit previous to his first imprisonment to which no allusion is made in the Acts. But in that case we should rather expect to find some mention of "Brethren" there, when the Apostle touched at the Fair Havens on his way to Rome, Acts xxvii. 8. The directions in this Epistle indicate an imperfectly organised Church, but one which had been in existence long enough to admit irregularities, and to be endangered by false teachers.

5. *shouldest set in order.*] Rather shouldest **further** set in order. St. Paul had apparently commenced the organisation of the Cretan Church, and had left Titus to complete it.

6. *the husband of one wife.*] See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

*having faithful children.*] Rather **children who are believers**, and therefore himself, probably, not a recent proselyte. See 1 Tim. iii. 6. An indication, perhaps, that Christianity had been planted for some time in Crete.

*riot.*] **Profligacy.** The word includes the notions of extravagance and of indulgence in vicious pleasure.

*or unruly.*] For the reason of this requirement see 1 Tim. iii. 5.

7. *For a bishop.*] See on 1 Tim. iii. 1. Episcopus, overseer, is used in this case with propriety, as the synonym of Presbyter, instead of Elder in ver. 5, because the discharge of the office is here the prominent idea. He who overlooks others ought to be "blameless," having no charge brought against him, as God's steward.

8. *a lover of good men.*] Rather **a lover of good**: both of what is good and of those who are good.

9. *as he hath been taught.*] Lit., "according to the teaching:" which may either mean, as in the text, "according to the teaching which he has received," or, as in the margin, "in his teaching." The former sense seems preferable. It would be almost tautological

Digitized by Google

be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

10 For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision:

11 Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.

12 One of themselves, *even* a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians *are* alway liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.

13 This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;

14 Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth.

15 Unto the pure all things *are* pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving *is* nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.

16 They profess that they know God; but in works they deny *him*, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work [1]reprobate.

[1] Or, *void of judgment.*

---

to say that by holding fast the faithful word in his teaching, he will be able to exhort by sound doctrine. It is because he holds fast the same teaching which he has himself received, that he will have ability both to exhort believers in the sound doctrine, and to confute the gainsayers.

10–16. Character of the false teachers whom Titus would have to oppose, and of the Cretans in general.

**10.** *For.*] *I. e.* And there is great need of these qualifications in those who aim to be ordained presbyters at Crete; "for there are many, &c."

*they of the circumcision.*] *I. e.* converts from Judaism.

**11.** *who.*] *I. e.* "being, as they are, men who."

*subvert whole houses.*] *I. e.* subvert the faith of whole families.

**12.** *a prophet of their own.*] The first clause of the quotation is found in Callimachus, an Alexandrian poet of the time of the Ptolemies (Hymn to Zeus 8). The connection in thought between prophet and poet was close: ("carens quia vate sacro"): but the whole line is said by Jerome to be taken from the Chresmi (χρησμοί) of Epimenides, a prophet-poet, born at Phæstus and living at Gnossus, in Crete, in the sixth century before Christ.

**13.** *This witness.*] Rather **testimony** "is true." And such was the general opinion as collected from Polybius, Livy, Strabo, Plutarch, and others. The three worst Kappas, or K's, according to the Greek proverb, were the Kretans, the Kappadocians, and the Kilicians: and "to cretize," according to Suidas, meant "to lie."

*rebuke them.*] "Convince them of their error."

**14.** *Jewish fables.*] See on 1 Tim. i. 4.

*commandments of men.*] So our Lord (Matt. xv. 9) "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men:" and cf. Col. ii. 22. The commandments, as the context shows, were ascetic and ceremonial.

**15.** *Unto the pure all things are pure.*] All things, that is, to which the distinction of clean and unclean has been applied. Cf. Rom. xiv. 14, and 1 Cor. viii. 4–8. Moral impurity is, of course, not in question. Besides the difference of meats, we have other instances of ceremonial distinctions given in Mark vii. 4, 8.

*them that are defiled and unbelieving.*] "Practical unbelief is only too commonly allied with moral pollution." Bp. Ellicott.

*but even their mind and conscience is defiled.*] Rather **but in their case both their mind and their conscience have been defiled.** The pronoun "their," αὐτῶν, is in the Greek emphasized by its position. "Mind, νοῦς, in the N. T. is not merely reason or understanding, but includes the affection and will" (Bp. Wordsworth). Cf. "a reprobate mind," Rom. i. 28; Eph. iv. 17. Pollution of the affections and will distorts the practical reason and dims the understanding; but, yet worse, it defiles also the conscience, and thus weakens and blinds the faculty which is judge in the breast, and diverts its decisions to the side of evil. The last stage of this defilement of conscience is described in Rom. i. 32, "who not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

**16.** *They profess that they know God.*] Probably they laid claim to a higher degree of knowledge, and the terms Gnosis "knowledge" and Gnostic might already be beginning to be used arrogantly by teachers.

Digitized by Google

who were combining Jewish traditions with Asiatic theories. See Bp. Lightfoot on Colossians.

*being abominable*,] Not perhaps without a tacit reference to the unclean meats, &c. which they would call "abominations;" the true abominations being to be found in their own lives and hearts.

*reprobate.*] Rather **worthless**: tried and found of no worth.

## CHAPTER II.

1 *Directions given unto Titus both for his doctrine and life.* 9 *Of the duty of servants, and in general of all Christians.*

BUT speak thou the things which become sound doctrine:

2 That the aged men be [1]sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience.

3 The aged women likewise, that *they be* in behaviour as becometh [1]holiness, not [2]false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things;

4 That they may teach the young women to be [1]sober, to love their husbands, to love their children,

5 *To be* discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.

6 Young men likewise exhort to be [1]sober minded.

7 In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine *shewing* uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity,

8 Sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you.

[1] Or, *vigilant.*

[1] Or, *holy women.*

[2] Or, *makebates.*

[1] Or, *wise.*

[1] Or, *discreet.*

---

CHAP. II. 1.—III. 11. Direction to Titus, in opposition to such false teachers, to teach sound doctrine in its application to different ages and conditions of men, to his own conduct, and to the treatment of heretics.

**2.** *That the aged men.*] The correct rendering: not Presbyters. Age, not office, is here designated.

*temperate.*] *I. e.* self-restrained in all things, not merely in meat and drink.

*in patience.*] Chrysostom observes that patience is substituted for hope, as the third grace with faith and charity, as being especially the virtue of old men.

**3.** *behaviour.*] **Demeanour**: outward deportment, in manner, habits, dress, &c. which indicates the inward principle.

*as becometh holiness.*] Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 10.

*not false accusers.*] **Slanderers**, 1 Tim. iii. 11.

*not given to much wine.*] Lit., not **enslaved by much wine**; according to Plato, a besetting sin of the Cretans.

**4.** *That they may teach.*] Discipline, school.

**5** *keepers at home.*] οἰκουρούς. the reading for which authority preponderates. There is, however, another reading, οἰκουργούς, supported by some of the best MSS., but found nowhere else in the New Test. or in any other author. It is of course possible that this rare word may have been changed by transcribers to one much better known. The meaning would be "workers at home," finding their work in their own home; and therefore not, like the young widows in 1 Tim. v. 13, "learning to be idle by going about other houses."

*good.*] **Kind.**

*blasphemed.*] **Evil spoken of**: which it would be, if, marked out as Christian women, they failed in their conjugal duties.

**6.** The young women being thus committed to the instruction of the aged women, the Apostle turns to the young men.

*sober minded.*] The frequent occurrence of this precept—four times in six verses—may be explained by the character of the Cretans given in i. 12, 13.

**7.** *shewing thyself a pattern of good works.*] Especially as. in dealing with the young, example is more persuasive than precept.

*uncorruptness.*] *I. e.* sincerity.

*sincerity.*] Omit. ἀφθαρσίαν is not in the best MSS.

**8.** *Sound speech, that cannot be condemned.*] Discourses *i. e.* not only sound in doctrine for the instruction of the Church, but so well considered and judiciously applied as to give no undue advantage to opponents.

*he that is of the contrary part.*] Whether heathen. or judaizing teachers.

Digitized by Google

9 *Exhort* servants to be obedient unto their own masters, *and* to please *them* well in all *things;* not [1] answering again;

[1] Or, *gainsaying.*

10 Not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.

11 For the grace of God [1] that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,

[1] Or, *that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared.*

12 Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;

13 Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;

14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity,

---

*of you.*] Rather **of us**—the preferable reading.

**9.** *servants to be obedient to.*] **Bondslaves to be in subjection to.**

*answering again.*] **Gainsaying,** as in the margin; disputing their orders.

**10.** *shewing all good fidelity.*] *I.e.* not a service merely which aims at good appearances, but which arises from good principle. Cf. Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22.

*God our Saviour.*] **Our Saviour God.**

**11.** The reason of this injunction, and indeed, more remotely, of all which precedes, as well as the motive for obeying them, is the universality of God's love in the redemption of man, embracing slaves as well as others.

*For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.*] Rather, **For the grace of God appeared which bringeth salvation to all men**—to bondslaves among the rest, and therefore involving all men in the obligation to holiness. "The grace of God" is here that highest instance of His free mercy, the gift of His own Son; purposed indeed before the foundation of the world, but which "appeared" at the incarnation of the Word, and in the life, passion, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Cf. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10. The translation "appeared unto all men" is weak, and misses the stress of the argument—the universality of salvation inferring the universality of obligation. "Appeared," "shone upon the world," as "the day-spring from on high." Cf. Tit. iii. 4.

**12.** *Teaching us.*] Rather **Disciplining us**, not instructing merely, *i.e.* by self-denial and mortification of the carnal will.

*that.*] **In order that**—the object of the discipline.

*denying.*] Both in heart and deed. It is more than avoiding, says Chrysostom; it implies hatred and aversion.

*worldly lusts.*] For what these are, see 1 John ii. 15, 16.

*should live soberly, righteously, and godly.*] Fulfilling our duties to ourselves, to our neighbours, and to God.

*this present world.*] Lit., "the present age," *i. e.* the present state of being.

**13.** *Looking for, &c.*] Rather **Looking for the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.** "The blessed hope" is the appearing. "Appearance of the glory" which is the literal translation, is also the correct one. It is the revelation of the *glory* of Him who before came in humility, which constitutes the blessed hope. On the attitude of Christians, as waiting and looking for the coming of their Lord in glory, compare 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. For the rendering of the last clause, which is more doubtful, see note at the end of the chapter.

**14.** *Who gave himself.*] "Himself" is emphatic: "his whole self, soul and body, and all He had or was; Himself, God-man, which was certainly the greatest gift that was ever given, the highest price that was ever paid for anything in the world" (Beveridge).

*for us.*] ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, both for our benefit and salvation," and "instead of us," as Philemon 13, where the same preposition ὑπὲρ σοῦ, is "instead of thee," "in thy stead."

*that he might redeem us.*] By the ransom of His own blood "from all iniquity" which was holding us in bondage. John viii. 34. The other idea contained in "redemption," the setting free from condemnation, is found in Eph. i. 7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."

*a peculiar people.*] So 1 Pet. ii. 9. The word "peculiar," περιούσιος, meaning originally "what remains over and above," and so "set apart as such," came to signify "separate from," with perhaps occasionally the additional notion of "superior to." The title "a peculiar people," which belonged to the Jewish Church under the old covenant, is transferred by St. Peter and St. Paul to the Christian

Digitized by Google

and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

15 These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee.

---

Church under the new. The differentia, however, and mark of separation under the Gospel, is zeal for good works.

15. *These things.*] All that I have been dwelling upon "speak;" and "exhort" the faithful, and "reprove" the disobedient and careless "with all authority."

*Let no man despise thee.*] Not here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 12, on account of "thy youth;" but do this with such gravity, earnestness and consistency of conduct, that no one shall have any ground for slighting thy admonitions. Speak so as to command respect.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on ver. 13.

The words τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ will also bear the translation "of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ." It must be admitted that the omission of the article before "Saviour," does not necessarily require "God" and "Saviour" to be understood of the same person. The general rule that when two or more attributives, joined by a copulative, are assumed of the *same* person or thing, the article is inserted before the first and omitted before the others, must be taken with many exceptions. Among the rest, it will not hold good when the latter attributives have in themselves, or by usage, assumed somewhat of the character of a proper name, as was the case early with the appellation "Saviour:" and the position of the pronoun "our," ἡμῶν, after σωτῆρος, instead of in immediate connexion with Θεοῦ, gives some little weight to the argument for taking the words separately. It is argued, too, that in all other places where "Saviour" is applied to "God," there is a *distinction* between the Father and the Son, either expressed or implied, instead of an *identification*. So a few verses further on, iii. 4-6, "God our Saviour." . . . . "which *he* shed on us abundantly *through Jesus Christ* our Saviour:" and cf. 1 Tim. i. 1, and 1 Tim. ii. 3-5. In the doxology which closes the Epistle of St. Jude (ver. 25), the best MSS. add to "God our Saviour" the words "through Jesus Christ our Lord." And so, apparently, 1 Tim. iv. 10, and Titus i. 3. Hence it is inferred to be more probable than otherwise, that "the great God" and "our Saviour Jesus Christ" are contradistinguished, not identified, here too, and that our version, together with the Vulgate, Syriac and others, is right. On the other hand, there is the all but universal consent of the Greek Fathers, as well before as after the Arian controversy, in interpreting "the great God," as well as "our Saviour," of Jesus Christ. Ignatius, Clement Alex., and Hippolytus appear to have thus understood it, as well as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact; and among the Latin Fathers, Cyprian, Jerome, and Primasius. The expression "the blessed hope" seems to point to the Son, who is called "our hope," 1 Tim. i. 1, and "the hope of glory," Col. i. 27. Again, the word "appearance,"—epiphany or manifestation,—is used in five other places by St. Paul, and always for the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. i. 10, 2 Tim. iv. i. 8, and in all these places but 2 Tim. i. 10, for his future coming, as here. (The verb "appeared," however, is used more generally of the Gospel dispensation in Titus ii. 11, iii. 4.) To this it may be added that when in the New Test. the coming *in glory* is spoken of it is almost always with reference to the Son, and commonly in connection with his humanity, as "the Son of man." See Matt. xvi. 27, xix. 28, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31; Col. iii. 4. Finally, the epithet "great" is nowhere else in the New Testament applied to God the Father; but it might be well used with a special application and emphasis when it is the Son who is spoken of as God. So 1 John v. 20, "his Son Jesus Christ. This is the *true* God and eternal life." On the whole, it seems more probable that the words "great God" as well as "Saviour" apply to Jesus Christ, the appearance of whose glory is the Christian's blessed hope and constraining motive. It has, however, been well said by Dean Alford, who maintained the opposite view, "Whichever way taken, the passage is just as important a testimony to the divinity of our Saviour: according to the translation, 'our great God and Saviour,' by asserting his possession of deity and right to the appellation of the Highest: according to the other, 'of the great God and of our Saviour,' even more strikingly asserting his equality in glory with the Father in a way which would be blasphemy if predicated of any of the sons of men."

Digitized by Google

## CHAPTER III.

1 *Titus is yet further directed by Paul, both concerning the things he should teach, and not teach.* 10 *He is willed also to reject obstinate hereticks:* 12 *which done, he appointeth him both time and place, wherein he should come unto him, and so concludeth.*

PUT them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work,

2 To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, *but* gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men.

3 For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, *and* hating one another.

4 But after that the kindness and [1]love of God our Saviour toward man appeared,

5 Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;

6 Which he shed on us [‖]abund-

[1] Or, *pity.*

[‖] Gr. *richly.*

---

CHAP. III. 1. *to principalities and powers.*] rather **to magistrates, to powers,** as the same two words are rendered in Luke xii. 11, from which they may have been taken. The copula "and" is omitted in the best MSS. The Cretans, who had been subjugated to Rome by Metellus, B.C. 67, and whose island now formed part of the province of Cyrene, under a Proprætor with the title of Proconsul, had never lost the remembrance of their democratic institutions, and were impatient and turbulent under foreign rule; an impatience in which the Jewish population doubtless shared.

*to obey magistrates.*] Rather **to be obedient subjects.**

*to be ready to.*] *Ready* **for**: not merely to obey, but to pay willing obedience. These words are quoted by Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.* 2).

2. *gentle.*] **forbearing,** patient, as in 1 Tim. iii. 3.

3. *For we ourselves who were sometimes.*] *I.e.*, I say to *all* men, "for we ourselves *were* once as they are now." "Were" is emphatic.

4. And that we are no longer such is due to no merit of our own; it is of God's free grace: not on account of works of righteousness which we have done, but of the love of God for us, and of the means which He has provided in the Gospel for our regeneration, justification, sanctification, and adoption to an inheritance of eternal life. The connexion is clear and natural, and leaves no room for requiring a reference to the Marcionite theory of a God of love.

*But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward men appeared.*] Rather, **But when the goodness and the love to man of our Saviour God appeared.** Goodness and philanthropy (the word in the Greek) are equivalent, or nearly so, to "grace" in ii. 11. They occur together, as if from this passage, in Justin Martyr (Dial. cum Tryphone 47), ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία.

*appeared.*] See ii. 11 and note at end of that chapter.

5. In this passage, which is a brief but pregnant epitome of the Gospel, the scheme of man's salvation is regarded only from the side on which it is wholly God's work, without taking note of the conditions and qualifications, which, however much they too are God's work, are required from the co-operation of man. The apostle was dwelling on the truth that the change referred to in ver. 3, is not due to ourselves or our own merit, but to God's grace. He therefore had no occasion to allude here to the qualifications or stipulations required at baptism, nor to the faith by which man is justified, nor to "the working out his own salvation," which is one of the instruments by which the Holy Ghost renews us day by day, nor to the holiness which is the character and badge of the heirs of eternal life. All this is needed; but, viewed from God's side, it is not by anything which man has done or could do, but by his own free mercy that God has saved him.

6. *Not by works of righteousness which we have done.*] **Not by works in righteousness which we ourselves did.** "We" is emphatic. Not by our own works, even when done in a state of justification.

*he saved us.*] Placed us in a state of salvation. Those who are thus called out of the world into the Church, made members of Christ, pardoned and justified through faith in him, and have received the promise and earnest of the Spirit, are *so far* saved. Cf. Acts ii. 47.

*by the washing.*] rather **laver** or **bath** of regeneration, *i.e.*, baptism, which our 27th

Digitized by Google

antly through Jesus Christ our Saviour;

7 That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

8 *This is* a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.

---

Article defines to be "a sign" (an "effectual sign," Art. 25) "of regeneration or new birth." The word "regeneration" παλιγγενεσία occurs twice only in the N. T., here and in Matt. xix. 28 (which see), where it is equivalent to "the restitution of all things" (Acts iii. 21); the new birth of this fallen but redeemed world. Here its application is to individuals: the new birth of those who were born in sin and the children of wrath, into the membership of Christ and the family of God with its inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, of which baptism (the bathing or washing in water) is "the means whereby we receive the same and a pledge to assure us thereof." The requisite qualifications of the recipient do not, as has been said, lie in the line of the apostle's argument, which is concerned only with man's salvation considered as the product solely of God's free grace.

*and renewing of the Holy Ghost.*] *I.e.* "*by* the Holy Ghost;" the genitive of the agent. Some MSS. and the Italic version have "by the Holy Ghost;" and though the weight of authority is against the reading, it accurately expresses the sense. Of the whole clause the construction may either be "he saved us by the washing of regeneration and *by* the renewing of the Holy Ghost," or "by the washing of regeneration and *of* the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Both are grammatical, and either may be expressed by our version. Doctrinal considerations would rather give the preponderance to the former rendering: for although renewal or renovation by the Holy Ghost is a result and consequent of baptism rightly received, yet it is not, like regeneration, that of which the washing in water is the outward and visible sign. "It seems to mean," says Waterland, "a more particular kind of renewal, namely of the inward frame or disposition of the man." Regeneration, in the person baptized in infancy, must precede renovation or renewal; whereas renewal in the adult convert, may be and should be before, in, and after baptism. Regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit, in the due use of Baptism which God has ordained. Renewal is the work of the Holy Spirit together with the co-operation of man which God requires. Regeneration is an act once done and never repeated. Renewal is, or should be, perpetual and progressive, "the inward man being renewed day by day." (2 Cor. iv. 16, and cf. the collect for Christmas Day: "that we being regenerate and made thy children by adoption and grace, may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit"). Regeneration can never be totally lost; though it may, as a misused privilege, but minister to condemnation. Renewal may be lost.

7. *Which he shed on us abundantly.*] Literally "richly," "*he*," *i.e.* the Holy Ghost. The expression, "shed on us," or "poured out upon us," refers back to the prophecy of Joel ii. 28, and to the visible form of its accomplishment on the day of Pentecost. Acts, ii. 3, 33.

*through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*] "Through," for the merits and through the mediation of. As at the baptism of the Saviour, so in the regeneration and renovation of the believer, the three Persons of the blessed Trinity are present and concerned.

8. *That being justified, &c.*] Rather **in order that having been justified by his grace, we may in hope become heirs of eternal life.** This clause may depend either on "he saved us" in v. 5, or on "he shed on us" in v. 6. The former construction is the more probable. The apostle, having taught that it is of God's own free mercy only that He saved us, or placed us in a state of salvation, and having described the instrumentality by which this great change is effected, the washing of regeneration and the renewing by the Holy Ghost, proceeds to the object and end of it, the inheritance of glory. He has placed us in a state of salvation, in order that having been accounted righteous before Him by His own free grace, not for any deserts of our own, and being entitled thus to all the blessings which accompany righteousness, including the adoption of sons, "we may become heirs of eternal life," not indeed in present possession, but in hope. Cf. Rom. viii. 24, 25. "May become," the reading γενώμεθα is preferable to that of the received text, γενηθῶμεν.

*This is a faithful saying.*] *I.e.* this abstract, as it were, of the Gospel comprised in the last four verses.

*and these things I will, &c.*] More

Digitized by Google

9 But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.

10 A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject;

11 Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.

12 When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis: for I have determined there to winter.

13 Bring Zenas the lawyer and

---

literally, **and about (or respecting) these things I wish you to assert strongly in order that they who have believed God may make it their care to be foremost in good works.** Not "believed in God," *i.e.* in His existence, unity, Trinity, and the like; but "believed God," who has revealed this Gospel to us. Their practical holiness, which is so much insisted upon throughout the Pastoral Epistles, is assumed to be the result of a belief in God's free mercy in calling us into a state of salvation.

*these things.*] Either "these good works," or, generally, this kind of teaching which inculcates practice; in either case in opposition to the unprofitable and vain questions in v. 9. The latter sense is perhaps preferable. There would be a feebleness in saying "good works are good and profitable unto men."

**9.** *avoid.*] "Stand aloof from."

*genealogies.*] See on 1 Tim. i. 4.

*contentions, and strivings about the law.*] Lit., "legal disputes," arising out of interpretations of the law, such as abound in the Talmud, and of which the question (Matt. xxii. 36), "Which is the great commandment in the law?" in the spirit in which it was put, is an example.

**10.** *A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject.*] **After one and a second admonition** without effect, **shun.** Nothing more can be done with him. The word does not carry the idea of excommunication which is suggested by our translation. It is objected that "an heretick" in the sense of one who holds and teaches false doctrine, is a word of later date, and that the use of it here implies that the epistle was written after the Gnostic errors had formed sects and brought the word into common use. But there is nothing to shew that a teacher of doctrinal error is here meant. "Heresy" in the New Testament is "a sect," without even implying that the distinctive character of the sect is a doctrine at all. The Sadducees are called a heresy in Acts v. 17; the Pharisees in Acts xv. 5, xxvi. 5. The "heresies" at Corinth were marked by the names of orthodox teachers, Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and denoted parties but not false doctrine; and St. Paul in writing of them uses "schisms," σχίσματα, and "heresies," αἱρέσεις, as synonymous. See 1 Cor. i. 10, 12; xi. 18, 19. And as "heresy" was "a sect," so doubtless "a heretick," (a word which occurs only in this place in the New Testament), would be one who formed or joined a sect. Afterwards as the early sects which formed around various Gnostic tenets became erroneous in doctrine, the word "heresy" soon came to signify a sect holding or teaching erroneous doctrine, and at last the erroneous doctrine itself. A heretick was then a doctrinal sectarian. Meanwhile schism and schismatic which at first were synonymous, or nearly so, with heresy and heretick, retained their first meaning and became appropriate to parties and partisans, who divided the Church, without depraving the truth.

**11.** *Knowing.*] By his rejection of your admonition.

**12.** *When I shall send Artemas unto thee or Tychicus.*] Apparently to take charge of the Cretan Church in the absence of Titus. Of Artemas nothing more is known from Scripture. There is a tradition that he became Bishop of Lystra. For Tychicus, see note on 2 Tim. iv. 12.

*be diligent.*] **Hasten.** Many cities bear the name of Nicopolis. The three which have been variously selected as the city mentioned in the text, are 1. Nicopolis in Cilicia, which cannot, however, be made to coincide with any probable theory of St. Paul's movements. 2. Nicopolis in Thrace on the borders of Macedonia and called in the apocryphal salutation at the end of this epistle, "Nicopolis of Macedonia." This subscription has no authority, and indeed states the epistle to have been written at Nicopolis, in manifest contradiction to the apostle's words. This town may have lain in the way of St. Paul's journey, though there is no assignable reason why he should have designed it as his winter quarters. It was a place of small importance in comparison with 3. Nicopolis in Epirus on the Ambracian Gulf, which, in all probability, is the city to which St. Paul was going. Founded by Augustus to commemorate the victory of Actium, it had become a place of considerable



Digitized by Google

Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them.

14 And let our's also learn to [1]maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful.

[1] Or, *profess honest trades.*

15 All that are with me salute thee. Greet them that love us in the faith. Grace *be* with you all. Amen.

¶ It was written to Titus, ordained the first bishop of the church of the Cretians, from Nicopolis of Macedonia.

---

importance; and as many of the buildings were erected by Herod the Great, it is not unlikely that there were Jews living there. The situation was low and swampy, and by the time of Julian it had fallen into decay.

**12.** *Bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently.*] *I.e.* supplying them with all that they need for it. Of Zenas nothing certain is known; although various traditions of no value make him to have been one of the seventy, to have written a life of Titus, and to have been Bishop of Diospolis. We cannot even determine whether he was a Roman jurist or a Jewish doctor of the law. The word, *νομικός*, is used always in the latter sense in the Gospels; and in the epistles it does not occur excepting here, and just before in ver. 9, as an epithet to "strivings" or "contentions." For Apollos see on Acts xviii. 24. It is possible that Zenas and Apollos might be the bearers of this epistle.

**14.** *And let our's also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses.*] Rather, **and let ours too** (those who belong to our brotherhood at Crete) **learn to be forward in good works** (see ver. 8) **for the necessary wants**, *i.e.* of Zenas, Apollos, and other ministers of the Gospel. So did the Philippians in St. Paul's case. Phil. iv. 16. Some refer "ours" to Zenas and Apollos, "men of our order," "ministers," and explain the precept. "Let them do as I do; not merely be helped by you, but maintain themselves by honest labour." But not only is such a reference obscure, but it is not likely that the phrase "to be foremost in good works" would be met again so soon in a sense so very different. The connexion is obvious: "Do you help Zenas and Apollos with what they need for their journey; and not you only, but let all who belong to our brotherhood, learn to be kind, liberal, and helpful in such cases."

**15.** *in the faith.*] Not merely as friends, but as Christians.

*Amen.*] Is probably a later addition.

The subscription is in this case demonstrably spurious. St. Paul was not yet at Nicopolis, ver. 12.

Digitized by Google

# PHILEMON.

## INTRODUCTION.



### I. 1. Occasion of the Letter.

THE attempts which have been made to satisfy the natural curiosity of the readers of this brief but exquisite letter as to most of the persons who are mentioned in it by St Paul have been rather unsuccessful. Almost the only facts which appear with entire historical certainty from the evidence of the letter itself are these—that Philemon stood in the relation of master to Onesimus, his slave; and that Onesimus, who had run away to Rome, was sent back to Philemon by St Paul. It seems, however, in the highest degree probable, from internal as well as external evidence, that we can determine the relationship of other members of the household from which Onesimus had fled. If Onesimus is the slave, Philemon is the husband, Apphia the wife, Archippus the son. It is further evident that Philemon must have been in comfortable, if not affluent, circumstances; that for Christ's sake he shewed hospitality and love to distressed saints; and that he, as well as Archippus, occupied official positions in the Church, which brought them into relation with St Paul. But when we are told that Philemon, Archippus[1], Onesimus[2], were or became Bishops who occupied certain sees, we suspend our assent—not because the assumption of a regular episcopate at that time involves an anachronism—but because the evidence is imperfect or con-

[1] By St Jerome Archippus is said to have been Bishop of Colosse. But it would be a more plausible inference from Col. iv. 16, 17, that he was Bishop of Laodicea (Theodor. Mops. *in loc.*). Nor is external testimony altogether wanting to this effect. In the 'Apostol. Constit.' (VII. 46) Philemon is spoken of as Bishop of Colosse, Archippus as Bishop of Laodicea (Wieseler, 'Chronol. d. Apost.' 450 sqq.). Tillemont says that the Greek Menæa make him Bishop of Gaza, but martyred and buried at Colosse. Theodoret mentions that the house of Philemon was still shewn at Colosse, in the fifth century. It was also said that after discharging pastoral—perhaps episcopal—functions at Colosse, he taught at Gaza when Nero was emperor, and laid down his life in the proconsulship of Androcles. The connection of Archippus with *Laodicea*, and the admonitory passage (Col. iv. 17), have given rise to the deeply interesting conjecture that the "be zealous" of our Lord (Rev. iii. 19), addressed to the angel of the Laodicean Church, is the counterpart to the "take heed" of St Paul ('Colossians and Philemon,' Bishop Lightfoot, p. 43). There is, however, much force in the objection to this view of the message to Archippus in Colossians. When St Paul writes to a *Bishop*, he can speak sternly enough of the sins and failures of ministers (1 Tim. iii. 3—8, v. 20, 22, 24). When he writes to the *people*, he looks entirely at the better and more hopeful side (see note on 1 Thess. v. 12, 13). It would seem to be ethically inconsistent with his method to administer a rebuke to a pastor indirectly through his people —a process which might have been felt by Archippus to be wanting in delicacy and consideration. (So Theophyl. See also Storr, 'Interpret. Epist. ad Coloss.' *ad loc.*, and the note of Niemeyer, 'Comment. Hist. Gramm. in Paul. ad Philem. Ep.,' p. 6.)

[2] The conjecture that Onesimus may have been the Bishop of Ephesus mentioned by Ignatius is scarcely worthy of the contemptuous dismissal which it has received. The date of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians (prob. A.D. 107) presents no difficulty. The Onesimus of St Paul's Epistle to Philemon need not have been much more than 70 at that date. (We are unable to find any proof of the idea of some German scholars that the Ep. of Ignatius to the Ephes. implies that their bishop was a young man in A.D. 107.) It only states that the writer's acquaintance with him was recent (cap. v.). There is certainly something very striking and suggestive in the way in which after mentioning Onesimus, their visible bishop (ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπισκόπῳ), and just afterwards again in junction with three other names, Ignatius goes off with a series of allusions to the Epistle to Philemon (ὀναίμην ὑμῶν, cf. *v.* 20; οὐ διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν, cf. *v.* 8; δέδεμαι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, cf. *vv.* 1, 9, 13; προέλαβον παρακαλεῖν ὑμᾶς, cf. *vv.* 8, 9, Ignat. 'Epist. ad Ephes.' II. III.). Such an identification of Onesimus, Bishop of Ephesus, with the Onesimus of St Paul on the part of Ignatius seems not improbable. Onesimus, said in the Roman martyrologies to have been martyred at Rome, is remembered in the Greek Church on Feb. 15, in the Latin on Feb. 16.



Digitized by Google

flicting. That the letter was delivered by Onesimus is clear, not so much from the subscription which was added at a later period, as from the whole context and nature of the case. What else is certain is mainly this, that the fugitive slave,—thief as well as fugitive,—was converted and apparently baptized by St Paul[1]; that he rendered the Apostle services, deeply felt and recognised; that he was loved by his instructor with a peculiar tenderness, witnessed to by that wealth of pathetic terms of endearment—his son (*v.* 10); his brother (*v.* 16); his heart (*v.* 12); his very second self (*v.* 17).

2. ANALYSIS OF ITS CONTENTS.

An analysis of this tenderly beautiful Epistle may seem as superfluous as the analysis of an Idyll. Yet such a structural framework may serve to shew that the Apostle had formed no overweening estimate of the *weight* and *strength* with which his Epistles impressed contemporary readers (2 Cor. x. 10). The very whirl and rush of words and apparent dislocation of construction is not without its meaning.

i. *The Salutation.* *vv.* 1, 2, 3.
ii. *The Prelude.* *vv.* 4, 5, 6, 7.

Affectionate introduction.

His thankfulness for his friend, *v.* 4; caused by what he had heard of Philemon's true love and faith, *v.* 5; subject of his prayer, *v.* 6; beautiful result of Philemon's goodness, *v.* 7.

iii. *The Request.*

This request might be based upon rightful *authority*, *v.* 8.

[1] The spiritual generation spoken of in *v.* 10 is, however, not to be understood of baptism only, but of Christian teaching and instruction. Cf. Clem. Alexandrin. 'Strom.' Lib. I. "When St Paul so often calls Onesimus his son, his heart, &c., when he says that he was wishing to retain Onesimus with him to minister unto him in the bonds of the Gospel, we must infer that the slave had not only received elementary instruction from the Apostle but had been washed in the sacred laver and admitted to the mystery of the Holy Communion. Otherwise he could not have been considered entirely as a son and as one of the faithful, and designated for such a function in the Church. So that Onesimus was sent back to Philemon not as a mere catechumen but as a perfect and (so to speak) full-grown disciple of Christ" (S. Gentil. Opp. V. 383).

The Apostle prefers to base it

(*a*) Generally—upon **The Great Love.**
(*b*) Specially—upon his own
1. *Person,*
2. *Age,*
3. *Sufferings,*
4. *Sufferings for Christ.* *v.* 9.

The request itself—supported by reasons:

(*a*) Onesimus is St Paul's spiritual child, *v.* 10.
(*b*) As a changed man, he will fulfil the promise of his name, and be *useful* to Philemon, *v.* 11.
(*c*) St Paul loves Onesimus as a second self, *v.* 12;
(*d*) has sent him home, when his services would have been most welcome, for a reason connected with Philemon's highest welfare, *vv.* 13, 14.
(*e*) Possible design of God's overruling Providence in the whole affair, *v.* 15.
(*f*) Double affection, natural and spiritual, due to the slave who has become a brother, *v.* 16.
(*g*) Affection due to the Apostle as a partner in Christian life and work, *v.* 17.

The request—**Receive him as myself.**

iv. *The Undertaking and Signature,* *vv.* 18, 19.

The request renewed, *v.* 20.

v. *The Epilogue.*

(*a*) His confidence in Philemon, that he will do *more* than the request. *v.* 21.
(*b*) Happy anticipation of deliverance from custody, and hope of visiting his friend, *v.* 22.
(*c*) Joint salutations to Philemon, *vv.* 23, 24.
(*d*) Grace be with your spirit[1].

## II. THE RHETORIC OF THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

The *rhetorical* skill and beauty of the Epistle to Philemon was once a favourite subject with Christian commentators and critics. Modern writers, while doing ample justice to the tenderness and pathos of this short letter, have been

[1] See 'Anal. Logic. in Epp. Pauli,' authore Johann. Piscator. Pp. 156—161.

Digitized by Google

rather disposed to do scanty justice to the style and language[1]. It may be well to examine from this point of view one verse which has been considered especially liable to the charge of laxity of style, and disregard of symmetrical arrangement.

"Hearing of thy love and faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints" (*v.* 5). Some translators in ancient times, and many in later days, would at once accept M. Renan's version, as an equivalent, and, indeed, as a judicious correction—"de ta foi au Seigneur, de ta charité pour tous les saints[2]." Yet those who reverence Scripture may justly maintain that St Paul's own arrangement of the words has a higher rhetoric, under the guidance of a better wisdom. Let us suppose a writer to have before him two propositions, one of which is of special importance for his immediate purpose. He might be able to bring out that purpose most effectively by beginning and ending his sentence with the motive to which he wished to give prominence. From this point of view, it is instructive to compare the two contemporary letters to the Ephesians and Colossians. In those more elaborate and dogmatic pieces the idea of *faith* is of principal significance, and in one or other of its aspects is the leading subject of consideration. But in the Epistle to Philemon the writer's great object is to appeal to the principle of Christian humanity, to that true human love which flows from the constraining power of divine love, believed in and accepted. "Love towards the saints," and therefore to the brother for whom he pleaded, is consequently placed in the forefront. It is the first note of the whole strain. Let us conceive the Epistle presented to Philemon, when the delegates first arrive, and the returned fugitive anxiously awaits his master's decision. The letter is received with reverential joy. Philemon listens, or reads, in breathless expectation, and the very first word which falls upon his ear, or meets his eye, after the usual salutation, is—*love.* It has a force in this place which no other word could supply. St Paul, therefore, places *love* first; but as he never can forget *faith*, and Christ as the central object of faith, he puts *love* first, the *object* of the love last, faith towards Christ in the middle between the extremes. To translate, or paraphrase the verse in a way which loses sight of this peculiarity, and makes it simply a dislocated way of saying—"the faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus, and the love to all the saints"—is to lose the secret of the Apostle's simple rhetoric, and to sacrifice his purpose to a superficial facility[3].

[1] Bishop Lightfoot, pp. 334, 335.

[2] 'L'Antechrist,' p. 96. So the Syriac version (cf. Niemeyer, 'Comment. Hist. Gramm. in Philem.' p. 1; Niemeyer quotes St Matt. xx. 21; Acts xx. 21). Modern paraphrases of the Pauline Epp. often tempt one to apply Melanchthon's bitter but most just saying against the writers of his day to a very different class of people—"The Church has unlearnt her own language among the men of culture." (Linguam suam dedidicit ecclesia inter monachos. Melanchth. Opp. III. 888.)

[3] This form of construction is termed *epanodos* by old writers. The point in the text may be seen more clearly by arranging three passages in parallel columns.

| After I heard | Since we heard | Hearing of thy |
|---|---|---|
| 1. of your *faith* | 1. of your *faith* | 1. *love* |
| 2. in the Lord Jesus, | 2. in Christ Jesus, | 2. and *faith* which thou hast |
| 3. and *love* | 3. and of the *love* which ye have | 3. toward the Lord Jesus, |
| 4. unto all the saints. | 4. to all the saints. | 4. and toward all saints. |
| Eph. i. 15. | Col. i. 4. | Phil. *v.* 5. |

On the whole question, and on the propriety of reproducing, as far as possible, the order of the original in translating, see Bishop Jebb, 'Sacred Literature,' pp. 345—350. The word *all* here implies a beautiful argument. "If you are thus beneficent to *all* the saints, remember that our Onesimus is such. You should receive him that the fountain of a love so exuberant may not seem to be cut off from *him* only" (S. Gentilis, Opp. v. 386).

Digitized by Google

It may be well to note some other instances of the Apostle's rhetoric of love. A point comes when he must at last definitely write down the name which was so likely to irritate Philemon. With a subtle tact of infinite delicacy he defers to the last possible moment a name which might set up angry recollections in arms against his plea, until he has prepared the way by a whole series of affecting touches. "For the love's sake, I rather beseech—being such an one as Paul, aged, as it is also a prisoner of Jesus Christ, I beseech thee for my son, whom I have begotten in my bonds—Onesimus"—(*vv.* 9, 10). The man who can write with such noble variety is not wanting in the playful touch which so often accompanies true pathos. He plays—shall we say he almost puns?—twice, once upon the *meaning*[1], once upon the *name*[2], of Onesimus. With what subtle tenderness the Apostle takes the sting out of the slave's two great offences! Onesimus was a *fugitive*. How winningly St Paul puts it! "Perhaps he was *separated*" (*v.* 15).—He had stolen his master's property. "If he hath *wronged* thee, or *oweth* thee ought" (*v.* 18). It is not necessary to go very deeply into the distinctions of Roman law for the Apostle's bond—"I Paul have written with mine own hand." It is a gentle mockery of money business. The note closes in the same unrivalled strain by his asking to have a lodging prepared for him, if he is given as a gift in answer to the prayers of Philemon and his family. Philemon certainly would be ashamed to meet St Paul after having refused to grant him a request which lay so near his heart. The thought of seeing the Apostle would inspire Philemon with hope and joy—the passions which produce especial alacrity in complying with the wishes of those in reference to whom they are felt[1].

[1] *ἄχρηστον, εὔχρηστον*, *v.* 11. The further allusion, which some older commentators recognise, to the word *Christ* as then pronounced ("formerly without *Christ*, now right *Christian*"), is surely very probable. "Judæos impulsore *Chresto* assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit." Sueton. 'Claud.' 25. Tertullian ('Apol.' III.), and Lactantius ('Instit. Div.' IV. 7), speak of the mistake in pronunciation. Indeed, the very play upon the word thus pronounced is found in two very early writers ('Εγὼ μὲν οὖν ὁμολογῶ εἶναι Χοιστιανὸς ...ἐλπίζων εὔχρηστος εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ...Ἴσως δ' ἔτι αὐτὸς σὺ ἄχρηστος ὢν τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. Theophyl. 'ad Autolyc.' I. 1, p. 4, edit. Humphry. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ σε καταγελᾷν μου, καλοῦντά με Χριστιανόν· οὐκ οἶδας ὃ λέγεις. πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι τὸ χριστὸν ἡδὺ καὶ εὔχρηστον. *Ibid.* I. 12, p. 26—χριστιανοὶ γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα, τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι οὐ δίκαιον. Justin M. 'Apol.' I. 4.

[2] *ναὶ ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην ἐν Κυρίῳ*, *v.* 20.

III. Its connection with Roman Slavery.

One of the Epistles of the Captivity—that to the Ephesians—deals with one great department of private family-life, viz. the relation of husband and wife[2].

[1] Bauer, 'Rhetor. Paul.' I. 240 (quoted by Niemeyer). The style of St Paul has never been described with a more candid and reverent freedom than by Melanchthon, who certainly does not suppose that the Apostle "was as far as possible from common sense." "Let those who would take away his doctrine as trivial at least credit Paul with common sense. For, granting that the department of literary art which contains style and rhetoric was in great measure wanting to him, we must allow that he possessed invention and arrangement, which do not so much belong to technical learning as to ordinary judgment. And yet there appear in Paul's style certain unmistakeable notes of liberal knowledge. He uses words and figures which are redolent of Greek culture. His forms of reasoning are not without art. For he defines with the air of a man who knows what he is about. He carefully investigates the causes and first origin of the things which he discusses. He sees the points which are against him, and has in an extraordinary degree the power of removing some of these and mitigating others. He possesses too another characteristic of genuine literary art. He adds to his arguments epilogues, not mere otiose pieces of composition, but effusions quivering with the genuine beat of the affections. And he has the power of intermingling exactly in due proportions those more vehement emotions which are called *πάθη* with the tender affections which are called *ἤθη*. I, therefore, credit him not only with invention and arrangement, but with one department of rhetorical skill. For in his language there is a weight of its own, and an elegance of its own, though it is interspersed with Hebraisms, which mar the beauty of the composition. Besides, technical *composition* is wanting, *i.e.* care and skill in weaving the texture of periods, which is so important in securing *perspicuity*. But St Paul's style sometimes flows on to an undue length, because it wants the boundary of periods. Sometimes, again, he indicates the argument as if merely by a dot or point, by two or three words, so that the sentence is left imperfect, and, as it were, mutilated. We see Paul almost after the fashion of Thucydides employing a brief rugged style (*brevi, exili, et confragoso genere orationis*) whose brevity would be more luminous with more care in composition." 'Dedic. in Ep. ad Rom.,' Opp. IV. pp. 2, 3.

[2] Eph. v. 22—33.

Digitized by Google

Nowhere does St Paul proceed more entirely after his general rule of ascending from every particular form of duty to its ideal principle. The conjugal relation has its model in the love of the Incarnate God for His spouse, the Church; its rule is in the prophetic declaration of the long history of human love, uttered by the father of our race at the first bridal[1]. In the brief letter to Philemon, attached to the Epistle to the Colossians, a darker department of the private life of antiquity is touched with the light of the Gospel. The mode of dealing with the question of *slavery*[2] here is not, indeed, the same as that pursued in treating the question of *marriage*. But the difference, after all, is not so much in essential principle as in the *tone* which arises from the different circumstances and starting-points of the two Epistles. Ephesians is a treatise; Philemon is a *note*. Ephesians is the lyric; Philemon is the Idyll of the New Testament. Nor, again, does the letter before us, like those to the Ephesians and Colossians[3], advert to the dignity of even the slave's work—to the assurance that a heavenly Master's eye is upon him in the house, in the field, in the vineyard, in the mill, following him with sympathy to the obscure martyrdom of the cross and the dreadful plunge into the lampreys' pool. Yet the essential principles are the same. The salutation, "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" lifts the principal subject of this letter into the same high sphere of dogmatic truth from which the other Epistles take their beginning[4]. The motive above all others for the pardon of the slave may well be hinted at in the "Grace and peace[5]." Faintly, if at all, indicated by our translation, "for love's sake," the motive of the great love—of Him who is the Love—is conveyed in the words—"for the Love's sake do I rather beseech thee." (*v.* 9.)

The Epistle to Philemon cannot be thoroughly understood without some knowledge of the general condition of slavery in the Roman Empire. Possibly in the survey we may find a few illustrative particulars which have escaped the observation of some who have gone over this well-gleaned field.

In every province of the Roman Empire, in the centre of every family, there were to be found at the period of St Paul's ministry, in almost uncounted hordes, "an unhappy condition of men, who endured the weight, without sharing the benefits of society[1]." These slaves were devoted to an all but irremediable misery, and to the vices inseparable from their position. For in the rank and teeming soil of slavery vices grew up with irrepressible exuberance. Those which seemed the most contradictory flourished together under the sky which overhung the lands that were trodden by these unhappy beings. On the one hand the sensuality, the grossness, the cruelty even in women[2], the rapacity, the shamelessness which unlimited power breeds in those who habitually move a-

[1] Gen ii. 24; Ephes. v. 30, 31, 32.

[2] *Slavery* has been defined as a "certain condition, accidentally denoted by a name derived from the hatred felt by other nations for the *Sclavonic* race." The word *slave* probably arose in oriental France in the eighth century, when princes and bishops were rich in *Sclavonic* captives. From thence the word extended to general use, and to the modern languages. (Gibbon, ch. LV. Vol. V. p. 291, edit. Milman. See Müller. 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache,' s. v. *slave*.)

[3] Eph. vi. 5–8; Col. iii. 22.

[4] St Hieron. 'Comment. in Epist. ad Philem.' Tom. VII. p. 644 (edit. Migne).

[5] "Think, he seems to say, how much God has forgiven you, how you are saved by *grace*; imitate your Lord. He also prays for *peace* upon him, for that naturally follows, when we follow Him, when grace abides." St Johann. Chrysost. 'Homil. I. in Philem.,' who proceeds to apply with peculiar point the parable of the *slaves*, Matt. xviii. 23—35. Luther read the epistle from the same lofty point of view: "Here we see how St Paul layeth himself out for poor Onesimus, and pleadeth his cause with his master; and so setteth himself as if he were Onesimus, and had himself done wrong to Philemon. Even as Christ did for us with God His Father, thus also doth St Paul for Onesimus with Philemon. We are all His Onesimi to my thinking." (Quoted by Bishop Lightfoot, 'Colossians and Philemon,' p. 318.)

[1] Gibbon.

[2] The lines of a great French poet are drawn from the original:

Lesbie—en se faisant coiffer, heureuse, ayant
Son Tibulle à ses pieds qui chantait leur tendresses—
Si l'esclave Persane arrangeait mal ses tresses,
Lui piquait les seins nus de son épingle d'or.

Victor Hugo, 'La Légende des Siècles. Décadence de Rome.' Tom. I. 52.

Digitized by Google

mong fellow-creatures who are totally unable to resist the approaches of their lust or the exorbitance of their anger. On the other hand, vices apparently inconsistent with these, of a type uglier and meaner still, flourished and abounded. The restlessness of tyrannical espionage hunted out an assassin in every cowering fugitive. A sleepless suspicion hated and despised the miserable creature whom it had injured. The haughtiest of men and women went to their beds, haunted by the nightly fear of an outbreak among their hundreds of dependents, and of fires to be quenched in pools of blood[1]. "An atmosphere broods over slave-states charged with the fear which springs from the consciousness of a great wrong[2]." Such were the vices which slavery engendered in the hearts of those whom the institution was supposed to profit. The effect upon the slaves themselves is written upon a hundred pages of classical literature, frequently with a cynical unconsciousness. There we read the meanness, the flattery, the cowardice, the suppressed hatred, the impotent bursts of fury, the dexterity in gratifying odious desires, the despair which catches at every villainy and every sensuality as a golden opportunity of enjoyment upon a rapid journey to an inevitable cross[3]. The reflex action upon the masters and their families was immense. The laziness, the lying, the sulkiness, the thievish propensities of the majority of slaves, must have been a perpetual source of irritation to their masters. Onesimus must perpetually have provoked Philemon. He was not only a slave, but a Phrygian, incorrigible except by blows, nervous and cowardly to the last degree[1], in the estimation of the markets. But even this perpetual exasperation of temper is a trifle compared with the more terrible perils of a deeper contamination. The family ought to be a retreat where "purity reposes in the bosom of order." But the innocence of childhood, and the modesty of youth, were defiled by the precocious knowledge of evil which was forced upon them at every turn by the example or by the language of slaves—by the spectacle alike of the vices which such beings resisted, and of the vices which they invited.

Of the total loss of the most elementary rights upon the part of the slaves, a terrible instance occurred, in all probability at the very period of St Paul's first Roman captivity (A.U.C. 814, A.D. 61). A slave in the great Roman household of Pedanius Secundus had assassinated his master, whether from some odious jealousy, or because his liberty was unjustly refused after he had paid the price from his own *peculium*. The whole household, to the number of 400, was liable to capital punishment. Even Roman society was shaken to its centre by the prospect of such an execution, and the Senate hesitated to carry out the law. In a speech, whose substance is given by Tacitus, Cassius argued in favour of severity. His argument, an appeal to hatred and terror, concluded with the cool assumption that "every great example must be allowed a certain

[1] The argument of Cassius in favour of executing the four hundred slaves of Pedanius Secundus for complicity in their master's assassination is drawn with the darkest pencil of Tacitus. "*Suspecta* majoribus nostris fuerunt ingenia servorum, etiam cùm in agris aut domibus eisdem nascerentur, caritatemque dominorum statim acciperent...Postquam verò nationes in familiis habemus...colluviem istam non nisi metu coercueris." 'Annal.' XIV. 44. Mr Frost (*in loc.*) quotes the fine lines:

Sæpe etiam famuli, turbato ad limina somno,
Expavere trucem per vasta silentia vocem.
(Silius, I. 61.)

See also the terrible passage from Seneca, quoted *supra* in the note on Rom. vii. 13, and by Boissier, 'La religion Romaine,' Vol. II. p. 389.

[2] Mr Goldwin Smith: 'Does the Bible sanction American Slavery?' p. 86. The reason why the American Slave States had no reason to fear armed insurrection upon a large scale is powerfully given by Dr Channing—"Rome had servile wars, but her slaves had been freemen. In this country there are no materials for such wars." Works, v. 64.

[3] Scio crucem futuram mihi sepulchrum,
Ibi sunt majores siti.
Plaut. 'Mil. Glor.' I. 4. 19.

[1] "Phryges serò sapiunt"—"Phryges plagis meliores fiunt" (Cic. 'pro Flacco').

"Slaves are necessarily irritating," says Channing. "It is a significant fact that the Greek grammarians, with slavery before their eyes, derived the various names for slavery from vices. They found δοῦλος in δόλος, ἀνδράποδον in ἀποδόσθαι, and connected θεράπων with θείνω and τύπτω. They were no doubt better acquainted with slavery than etymology." See citations from the 'Etymol. Mag.' in Wallon's great work, 'Histoire de l'Esclavage.'

Digitized by Google

margin for injustice, and that any wrong which might be inflicted upon individuals was more than atoned for by the public benefit." The numbers, the age, the sex, the admitted innocence of very many, were not allowed to weigh against this base and artful special pleading. It is some satisfaction to know that our common humanity asserted itself by one brief start of indignant horror. The execution of the 400 could only be carried out after the issue of an Imperial decree, backed up by a strong body of troops who lined the whole way along which the condemned were dragged to the place of punishment[1]. No doubt there might be, and there were, exceptions to the general darkness of this picture. There are, for instance, monumental inscriptions which attest the existence of sympathy with the slave, and even of true concern for his loss. (Yet a painful suspicion insinuates itself as to some quoted by M. Wallon, note 12, II. 449.) One at least has been found, in which a son prematurely cut off speaks from the stone, and affectionately beseeches the father who survived him to grant the manumission of two slaves who had ministered to him[2]. Yet the poetry of Virgil may be appealed to on the other side. Virgil possessed that tenderness of touch which makes him "the first of the moderns." He sympathized with the free labour of the petty husbandman. One exquisite passage proves that he could understand and feel for the struggles of the poor and virtuous housewife,

—castum ut servare cubile
Conjugis, et possit parvos educere natos.

But evidence seems to be wanting that he ever wasted a sigh upon the abject and shivering slave-girl whom the mistress urged to her unrequited work, while the dreary torch-light glimmered through the shadows of the hour before the winter morning[1]. Later on it is only just to say that the slow progress of social improvement, or the secret infiltration of Christian ideas, produced a more humane spirit. Pliny could heave one eloquent human sigh over labour, forced from clogged feet, maimed hands, and branded brows—a labour which contaminated the very soil because it was extorted from despair[2].

But if the slave had no *rights*, so far as his person and property was concerned; if the terrible principle "nullum caput habet" was absolutely against him as regarded every form of advantage and enjoyment; this remorseless and cast-iron logic ceased to be consistent when it came to be applied to his duties and to his transgressions. When the slave was brought up for punishment, it was discovered that he was human after all. The law was peculiarly severe as regarded the offence which Onesimus had committed in running away. It deviated for a while from the region of fact into the subtle domain of intention; it became casuistical; it pursued the crime of crimes with a pedantic subtlety which almost anticipated scholasticism. The slave might have formed the intention of escape, and made some feeble attempts at preparing for future flight: he might then have given up his perilous scheme in despair. He might have crossed the threshold, and then at once in fear or penitence have returned. But repentance, return, restitution, could claim no pardon. The brand was equally to be affixed. There was one glimmering of human dignity in this, which exalted the "chattel personal" above the brute. The cattle could only stray; in virtue of his reasonable soul, every Onesimus was

[1] Tacit. 'Annal.' XIV. 42—45. Another terrible instance at an earlier date may be cited. A gallant slave had used a weapon in killing a ferocious boar; he was crucified for the offence. The great Roman orator frigidly observes—"*durum hoc fortasse* videatur, neque ego in ullam partem disputo." (Cic. 'in Verrem,' v. 3.)

[2] This was an example of what the lawyers technically termed manumission *verbis precativis*, and was tantamount to an instruction left by will to an inheritor. See M. Wallon, Liv. II. ch. x. 'de l'affranchissement.' II. 387.

[1] Noctem addens operi, *famulasque* ad lumina longo
Exercet penso.
'Æneid,' VIII. 411.

[2] In one of his most eloquent passages, Pliny contrasts the old cultivation of the soil by such as Cincinnatus ("gaudente terrâ vomere laureato et triumphali aratore") with servile labour. "At nunc eadem illa vincti pedes, damnatæ manus, inscriptique vultus exercent; non tamen surdâ tellure quæ parens appellatur colique dicitur ipsa; honore his assumpto, ut non invitâ eâ et indignante credatur sic fieri." C. Plin. Sec. 'Nat. Hist.' XVIII. 4.

Digitized by Google

capable of being an *erro*[1] or a *fugitivus*[2].

All that has been said bears upon the case of Onesimus. In spite of the distinction of Aristotle[3], St Paul felt friendship, an affection that was indeed paternal, for the slave whose soul he had awakened by his teaching, and whom he had probably himself baptized. (*v.* 10.) The stern purity of Christian morality (for Onesimus had been guilty of theft, *v.* 18), and the scandal which would certainly arise, if encouragement of social disturbance could plausibly be attributed to the Gospel, involved the painful necessity of sending back the fugitive slave to his justly offended master[4]. There was no denying that Onesimus might be subjected to danger. The saying that Phrygians were improved by flogging might be put to a cruelly practical proof. It was possible though certainly it was eminently improbable in a house which was also a *Church* (*v.* 2) that a cross might be his lot[5]. It might have been difficult to reconcile Onesimus himself to a return to Colosse. The slaves of various countries were credited or discredited in the market with congenital faults. If the Cretan was a liar, and the Dalmatian dangerously sulky, the Phrygian was laughed at upon the comic stage as an arrant coward[1]. And Onesimus was a Phrygian. But the nervous slave was sent back by St Paul with every precaution which the most delicate affection could take, in the company of Tychicus, with honourable mention as Onesimus "the faithful and beloved brother[2]."

There seem to be two references by St Paul in this letter to the Roman law about slaves, allusive to the only indications of humanity in that terrible jurisprudence, to the only softening fibres in that heart of stone. (1) St Paul says with pathetic iteration, "**I beseech**—I beseech thee" (*vv.* 9, 10 παρακαλῶ—παρακαλῶ σε). The law gave the Roman slave one real right. It relented with humane inconsistency upon one point and one only. For the slave in the Roman Empire the right of asylum did not exist. His only conceivable resource was that he might, in his despair, fly to a friend of his master, not for the purpose of *concealment* but of *intercession*. The owner, who was absolute as far as any formal tribunal was concerned, might be softened by the entreaties of the friend who took upon himself the office of intercessor (*precator*[3]). The Roman jurisprudence formally declared that the slave in flying to a friend of his proprietor with this intention did not incur the enormous guilt of becoming *fugitivus*[4]. St Paul, indeed, was unable to appear with Onesimus. But in the emphatic and repeated "*beseech*," he seems to declare himself the legal "*precator*." (2) The mention of Onesimus as "his son whom he had begotten in his bonds" (*v.* 10)

[1] The *erro* was *pusillus fugitivus*—"sorte de fugitif au petit pied" (M. Wallon, II. 60). The possession of so much æsthetic insight as is evinced by careful and intent study of pictures was presumptive evidence of this crime. Venuleius says of it—"*animi* potius quàm corporis vitium... veluti si... *tabulas pictas* studiosè intueatur."

[2] "Labeo ait *errare* et *fugere* jumentum posse; nec tamen *erronem* aut *fugitivum* esse posse." See quotation from Pomponius in M. Wallon, II. 60.

[3] Perhaps, however, justice has scarcely been done by many writers to this great memory. For Aristotle certainly admits the slave's humanity. "So far forth as he is a slave there is not friendship towards him, but so far forth as he is a man." And he adds with all his heart—δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναί τι δίκαιον πρὸς πάντα τὸν δυνάμενον κοινωνῆσαι νόμου καὶ συνθήκης, καὶ φιλίας δὴ καθ' ὅσον ἄνθρωπος. 'Ethic. Nicom.,' VIII. 11.

[4] "Otherwise many would blasphemously say—Christianity has been introduced into human life as a solvent of social relations,—if slaves are to be taken from their masters. It is a violent and revolutionary thing." St Joann. Chrysost. Procem. in Epist. ad Philem.

[5] The Roman satirist represents such a punishment as inflicted by a peevish mistress simply from caprice :

Pone crucem servo
... nil fecerit, esto :
Sic volo, sic jubeo.
Juvenal, Sat. VI. 218, sqq.

[1] "Comici Phrygas timidos illudunt." Tertull. 'de Anim.' XX. See quotations in Bishop Lightfoot ('Colossians and Philemon,' p. 312, note 2). The Cilician, Cappadocian, and Cretan, were called the three bad Ks. (See the vivid passage in M. Wallon, 'Histoire de l'Esclavage,' II. 61, 62.)

[2] σὺν Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, Col. iv. 9. Note the priority which is given by the position of the first adjective ('faithful') to the new relation of Onesimus.

[3] Plaut. 'Capt.' II. 3. 456.

[4] *Fugitivum non esse qui præripuisset se ad amicum, quem ad precandum perduceret* [l. 17, § 4 (Ulp.), D. XXI. 1]. See M. Wallon, 'De l'Esclavage,' II. 239—249.

Digitized by Google

may convey a second allusion to another merciful provision of law in the same breath. The Apostle solemnly declares Onesimus to be his son, his spiritual adopted child. But of the various forms of *manumissio justa*, the *adoptive* stands in the first rank[1]. With the title of son, the rights of domestic and civil life flow in upon the slave, new-born into the common family of humanity. Thus the Apostle seems in one short sentence to plead for the *pardon* and *manumission* of Onesimus, the first as his *precator*, the second by declaring him an *adopted son* (*vv.* 9, 10).

It will be seen how consistently with himself, and with the general character of Christian doctrine, St Paul writes in this Epistle, with its apparently surprising *reticence* upon the general character of an institution so odious as slavery. Slavery was not abolished by any one single text of the Old or of the New Testament. Under the elder Covenant, it existed from a very ancient date; but was mitigated from the first by such sublime precepts as those of Job (xxxi. 13, 14, 15), and by the softening influence of the Mosaic legislation. Christianity was but carrying Mosaism to perfection by admitting the slave within the impartial walls of the Church[2]. Under the New Testament it was not consistent with the divine quietness of the Gospel to preach what would have practically been a tremendous social revolution[3]. The word of truth, like Him from whom it came, can afford to be patient, because it is eternal. Certainly we look in vain for any detached text which insists upon emancipation. The Epistle before us, where if anywhere we might expect such an utterance, is studiously without it. The truth is that the whole spirit and genius of the Gospel is infinitely more powerful than any detached fragment of exhortation or command; and the temper and character which it forms is "first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be intreated, full of mercy[1]." One single precept of the Epistle to which the letter to Philemon was attached, wherever it was received as a divine message, carried emancipation in its womb. "Masters! give unto your slaves justice and equity[2]." But the right of the labourer

[1] "Servi, si adoptati sunt, *ex hoc ipso* posse liberari." 'Instit.' I. XI. 12. See M. Wallon, II. 238.

[2] Deut. xvi. 10.—17 (observe the "man-servant and maid-servant," *vv.* 11, 14). The point is put with great power by Mr Goldwin Smith, "Does the Bible sanction American Slavery?" pp. 62 sqq. "In 1 Kings ii. 39, two of the servants of Shimei run away to Achish, king of Gath. This, it is believed, is the sum total of slave disturbances in the annals of the Hebrew nation." Ibid. p. 89. Another contrast between Hebrew and Roman slavery may be found in comparing the incidental notice in Ezra ii. 65, with such statements as those in Plin. 'Nat. Hist.' XXXIII. 47. It would appear from the former that 42,360 persons possessed only 7,337 slaves. We are told by the latter that one man of great opulence left behind him 4,000 slaves.

[3] "It is," says S. Gentilis, "one of the objects of this Epistle, as regards what I may call the *jura* of Christianity, to shew that slaves are not technically manumitted nor to be wrested violently from masters, even when these last are Christians." Opp. V. 332.

[1] S. James iii. 17. For a masterly assertion of the *national* duty of emancipating the African slaves, on the ground of giving to others what we had received, see the following passage from a speech which has been pronounced to be the masterpiece of Pitt:

"Allow of this principle as applied to Africa, and I should be glad to know why it might not also have been applied to ancient and uncivilized Britain? Why might not some Roman senator, reasoning on the principles of some honourable gentlemen, and pointing to British *barbarians*, have predicted with equal boldness, 'There is a people that will never rise to civilization—there is a people destined never to be free—a people without the understanding necessary for the attainment of useful arts; depressed by the hand of nature below the level of the human species; and created to form a supply of slaves for the rest of the world'? Might not this have been said, according to the principles which we now hear stated, in all respects as fairly and as truly of Britain herself, at that period of her history, as it can now be said by us of the inhabitants of Africa?

"Had other nations adopted those principles in their conduct towards us; had other nations applied to Great Britain the reasoning which some of the senators of this very island now apply to Africa, ages might have passed without our emerging from barbarism; and we who are enjoying the blessings of British civilization, of British laws, and British liberty, might, at this hour, have been little superior, either in morals, in knowledge, or refinement, to the rude inhabitants of the coast of Guinea."

Pitt's Speeches, II. 89, sqq.

[2] τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα. Col. iv. 1. The second word means *equity*, equalness of treatment, not *equality*. "When we come to early races who have given their thoughts and feelings literary form, we find this conception of justice, as involving equalness of action, becoming distinct. Among the Jews, David expressed in words this association of ideas, when,

Digitized by Google

to his wages, the right of every man to his own person, the right of all to equal treatment by the law, are imbedded in Christian morality. St Paul's injunction is almost a satire to a Christian master of slaves. Give the slave "that which is just and equitable," and he ceases to be a slave[1]. Nor was ultimate emancipation only in the ethical code of Christianity. It was interlaced with almost every fibre of the Church's dogma and ritual. It was latent in the *facts* and *ideas* of Christianity—and indeed of the earlier dispensation when transferred to that happy soil—as the oak is latent in the acorn. The Father whom the Creed teaches us to worship is the common Father of all men. The Creator whom Genesis reveals "hath made of one blood all nations of men[2]." The dogma of the Incarnation lends dignity to human nature universally, and will not permit the intentional and systematic degradation of any who partake of it. In Baptism, the regenerate brother was gifted with the adoption which was his practical manumission. In the Holy Communion all were one bread and one body. Some of the foremost among the white-robed army of martyrs were slaves. The obscure drudge, the "qualis qualis" of the Roman jurists, sometimes became a Presbyter or Bishop[3].

It may afford matter for surprise that these premisses were not sooner drawn to their legitimate issue. It appears strange that Christians could have continued to be slaveholders. But the logic which follows ethical principles intermingled with vast masses of concrete social phenomena to their ultimate conclusions is slow in movement. Experience shews us that gross abuses, public, and even private[1], may co-exist with virtue and even piety, until the hour arrives, when the eye of conscience is brought to bear upon them[2]. A rude and rapid enfranchisement would have engaged the Church prematurely in a perilous conflict with an interest armed with the threefold adamantine mail of prescription, love of profit, and love of power. It might, for a time, have exposed a society used to forced and servile labour to something like starvation. It would have left on the land in every province of the Roman Empire a helpless population, totally unused to self-guidance, "unfurnished with the instinct of the brute or the educated intelligence of the man[3]." Centuries of Christian influence were needed to ripen into maturity the seeds of respect for self and for others—the sentiments of dignity and independence, which make communities capable of carrying out upon a large scale the robust and manly morality of social independence inculcated in St Paul's earliest letters[4].

Yet indications are not wanting that the inner meaning of the Epistle to Philemon did not escape the observation of Christendom from the earliest times—that the word which hovered upon the Apostle's lips[5], but whose utterance was forbidden for the time by the restraining Spirit, was heard by the inner ear of the Church. Three of these may be briefly mentioned. (1) In the monuments of ancient Rome, the "servus" or "libertus" is very constantly mentioned. It is said that such notices are found in considerably more than half of the extant remains. Yet in a number of Christian inscriptions of a similar nature in Rome, amounting it has been calculated to more than 1100, and all belonging to

praying to God to 'hear the right,' he said, 'Let my sentence come forth from thy presence; let thine eyes look upon the things that are equal;' as also, among early Christians, did Paul, when to the Colossians he wrote, 'Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal.'" (Herbert Spencer, 'Data of Ethics,' p. 164.)

[1] Channing, 'Remarks on Slavery,' Works, v. 17.

[2] Acts xvii. 26.

[3] Consider *e.g.* the lofty consciousness which inspires the language of Euelpistus when brought before the Roman magistrate—"Who are you?" demanded Rusticus. Euelpistus, a slave of Cæsar, replied:—"I, too, am a Christian, having been freed once for all by Christ (ἐλευθερωθεὶς ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ)."—Acta Martyr. S. Justin et Soc. S. Justin. M. Opp. II. 271. (Edit. Otto.)

[1] *e.g.* In the church, pluralities—in society, duelling and drinking habits.

[2] Channing, Works, v. 82.

[3] See Robertson, 'State of the World at the Establishment of Christianity.' Gibbon, Vol. I. 42, sqq. Edit. Milman. De Broglie, 'Hist.' I. 306.

[4] See 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12; 2 Thess. iii. 11, 12; and Introduction to those Epp.

[5] Bishop Lightfoot says with equal truth and beauty that, in the Epistle to Philemon, "the word 'emancipation' seems to be trembling on his lips, and yet he does not once utter it." ('Colossians and Philemon,' p. 323.)

Digitized by Google

the first six centuries of the Christian era, only about six are cited as making any distinct reference to this radical division of human life in ancient Rome. This seems to be the result of a primary instinct of the new life in Christ. The slave who received the one great call in a heavenly Lord is his Lord's freeman[1]. In that new sphere where Christ is all and pervades all there is neither bond nor free[2]. True, that St Paul never commanded Philemon to bring Onesimus before the first magistrate, and utter in his presence the two almost sacramental words "liber esto[3]." Yet the thought which inspired the language of St Paul in the Epistle to Philemon—"not now a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved" (*v.* 16)—became the thought of the Church, and may often have stayed the hand that traced the sepulchral characters, and inscribed, as it were, the "liber esto" over the slave in death, if it had been deferred in life[4]. (2) The earliest Christian writings agree in tone with the line of St Paul. Thus, among the Apostolic Fathers Ignatius at once prohibits haughtiness or contempt to slaves in a Christian household, and forbids slaves to shew a passionate and precipitate desire for emancipation[5]. (3) As soon as Christianity began to tell directly upon jurisprudence, a rapid series of laws favourable to slaves was passed (A.D. 314 to June 20, A.D. 322)[6].

It only remains to say that in philanthropy as in science there are three stages—the prelude, the epoch, and the sequel. The prelude is a period of aspiration, and half-blind guesses. The epoch brings the expression of the truth to its highest point. In the sequel, the principle once fixed in words, is extended and developed in practice. If space permitted, it would be no difficult task to apply the analogy to the influence of Christianity upon slavery. As far as the Epistle to Philemon is concerned, the epoch has come, and the principle is fully in St Paul's mind. The letter is unintelligible without it. In truth, if St Paul does not ask for emancipation, he asks for something more. From that brief note more especially went forth the spirit of manly tenderness and chivalry which was never completely extinct in the worst of times—which has stirred the hearts of men almost equally wherever Christ is named—which has prompted the Bull of Gregory XVI.[1] and the burning pages of Channing—which has not said its latest word even yet, but perpetually pleads for "sweet reasonableness" and peacefulness in the dealings of Christians with their *servants*. Slavery was a leprosy. The Church was unable to cleanse it at once, and was obliged to touch it for a while. But it was as in the beautiful legend of Catharine of Sienna and the leper whom she tended. The hand that was stricken with the leprosy for a little, grew fairer and whiter than before—when it had laid the leper in his grave.

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 22.

[2] Gal. iii. 28.

[3] See on this form, Wallon—'Histoire de l'Esclavage,' II. 388.

[4] Northcote, 'Roman Catacombs,' pp. 164, 165.

[5] "Despise not slaves, men and women. Let them not be puffed up, but do their servitude to the glory of God, that they may win from God a better liberty. Let them not too passionately aim at being manumitted out of the common fund, that they may not be found slaves of desire." (Ignat. 'Epist. ad Polycarp.' IV. p. 179, edit. Hef.) So Barnabas, "Thou shalt by no means rule thy slaves, male or female, who trust in God, with bitterness." (Barn. 'Epist.' XIX. p. 39.)

[6] It is not meant to ignore the fact that there had been a movement in this direction before Constantine. See De Broglie, 'Hist.' I. pp. 304 sqq.

## IV. External Testimony to the Epistle.

The *authenticity* of the Epistle to Philemon was probably never very seriously denied: its *inspiration* was unpopular in certain quarters, external to the Church. It is very necessary to remember that the objections to the inspiration of the letter came from anti-dogmatic, not from dogmatic Christians; that "in the battle of the Creeds," the defenders of the Catholic doctrine are the champions of the Epistle; that "the fierce current of prejudice," stemmed by Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, set in from a quarter external to the Church[2].

[1] Given in full by M. Granier de Cassagnac. 'Voyage aux Antilles,' II. 454—479.

[2] S. Jerome states that the arguments used against this Epistle were, either that it was not St Paul's; or, that, if it came from his hand, he was not always inspired. Its subject, they

Digitized by Google

To the irresistible internal evidence of the genuineness of the Epistle modern criticism has added something in bringing out with fuller evidence the peculiarly Phrygian character of the name of Apphia[1].

As to external evidence. It is difficult to suppose that the Epistle was not in the mind of Ignatius in writing his Epistle to the Ephesians (see *supra*, the references to Philemon, *vv.* 20, 8, 1, 9, 13, 8, 9, in Ignat. 'Epist. ad Ephes.' II., III.). The book of Theophilus to Autolycus contains the same remarkable *paronomasia* which is found here in *v.* 11[2]. Tertullian says that this Epistle alone was "defended by its own brevity, so as to escape the falsifying hands of Marcion," and proceeds to speak of it as written to one man, like the Epistles to Timothy and Titus[3]. It is expressly quoted from by Origen[4]. It is found in the ancient Muratorian canon[5].

[Was St Paul personally known to the Colossians, and had he ever been at Colosse before the writing of the Epistles to Colossians and Philemon?

The various reasons for answering this question in the negative have been stated *supra* (Introduction to Epistle to Colossians, especially i. 2, and note especially on ii. 1). It may be questioned, however, whether sufficient weight has been attributed to three facts.

1. Acts xvi. 6. As St Paul and Timothy visited Phrygia together, it is probable that they would visit Colosse and Laodicea. Now the salutation in Colossians iv. 15[1] would seem to imply personal knowledge of the *Laodicean* Church. But considering the proximity of the two towns (Introduction to Colossians, i. 1), it is unlikely that St Paul should have been present in one without going to the other.

2. St Luke's language in describing the Apostle's second visit to Phrygia some years later is very emphatic ("He went over *all the country* of Galatia and Phrygia in order, confirming *all the* disciples," Acts xviii. 23). It would scarcely be consistent with so considerable an exception as that of a Church which St Paul looked upon as of sufficient importance for one of his greatest Epistles.

3. Above all, sufficient weight has scarcely been given to various indications supplied by the Epistle to Philemon. Philemon evidently lived at Colosse. St Paul's acquaintance with Philemon's house, and its members (*vv.* 1, 2), coupled with his description of Onesimus as a Colossian (Coloss. iv. 9) implies some local and personal knowledge. It appears in the highest degree probable that the step which Onesimus took in flying to Rome, and seeking St Paul, was suggested by the impression which had been made upon him by personal reminiscence of the Apostle's teaching and presence at Colosse.

Most, at least, of these points had occurred independently to the writer before studying Bishop Wordsworth's observations. New Testament, II. 312—315.]

argued, proved that it was a commendatory note, not a dogmatic document. Jerome argues that its universal reception by all Churches in the whole world is unaccountable, except on the hypothesis of a Pauline origin. As to apparent triviality and everyday style, he points to such passages as 2 Tim. iv. 13; Galat. v. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 12; with their apparently petty details, outbursts of human feeling, admissions of uncertainty. For the brevity of the letter he refers to the minor Prophets, and concludes his defence by a quaint quotation of Rom. ix. 28, as if the very shortness of Philemon were in consonance with the spirit of the Gospel. ('Comment. in Epist. ad Philem.,' Prol., Opp. VII. 637, 638.)

[1] Not *Appia*, a Roman name, but *Apphia*, which occurs very frequently in *Phrygian* inscriptions. See the exhaustive discussion in Bishop Lightfoot ('Colossians and Philemon,' pp. 306—308). The name of Philemon occurs in connection with Phrygia in the beautiful legend of Philemon and Baucis, but "is not distinctively Phrygian."

[2] Theophyl. 'ad Autolyc.' I. § 1, quoted above.

[3] Tertull. 'c. Marcion.' v. 21.

[4] In Jerem. XIX.

[5] See the subject fully discussed in Kirchofer, 'Quellensammlung,' pp. 205 sqq.

[1] "The brethren in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church in his house."

Digitized by Google

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

# PHILEMON.

4 *He rejoiceth to hear of the faith and love of Philemon,* 9 *whom he desireth to forgive his servant Onesimus, and lovingly to receive him again.*

PAUL, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and Timothy *our* brother, unto Philemon our dearly beloved, and fellowlabourer,

2 And to *our* beloved Apphia, and Archippus our fellowsoldier, and to the church in thy house:

---

1. *Paul,* **prisoner** *of Jesus Christ*] It will be observed that St Paul does not give himself the title of *Apostle* in this place. The very first word in which he speaks of himself is pathetic. He refers to his chains no less than *five* times in this short letter (*vv.* 1, 9, 10, 13, 23). He feels it glorious to suffer shame for his Lord's sake, and blessed to inherit the beatitude of those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake (Matt. v. 10). He literally fulfils the exhortation of St Peter (1 Pet. iv. 14—16). "To me it seems a loftier thing that he should style himself *prisoner of Jesus Christ* than *Apostle*. The Apostles gloried because they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the Name (Acts v. 41); but the authority of bonds is irresistible. He who is about to plead for Onesimus feels that he should plead in such a form that he could not be refused" (S. Hieron. 'Comm. in Ep. ad Philem.,' who also refers to the close of the Epistle to Gal., vi. 17).

*and Timothy* **the brother**] Timothy is joined with St Paul in the opening verse of two other Epistles of the captivity (Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1). The addition of Timothy's name would add weight to St Paul's request.

2. *And to Apphia* **the sister**] (1) As regards the *form* of the name and its certainly Phrygian character, see Bp Lightfoot ('Colossians and Philemon,' pp. 306—308). (2) It seems in the highest degree probable that Apphia was Philemon's wife; probable, but in a lower degree, that Archippus was their son. The mention of a *woman* between two such men, one the Apostle's "fellow-labourer" (*v.* 1), the other his "fellow-soldier" (*v.* 2), is a noble example of the spirit of the Gospel, and of St Paul's language, "neither male nor female" (Gal. iii. 28). It is an unobtrusive yet real hint of the elevation of *woman*, as the whole letter is of the release of the other victim of classical civilization, the *slave*. "Thus, supported on both sides, she seems to have the place not of her sex but of her worth" (S. Hieron. 'Comm. in Philem.' Opp. Tom. III. 643, ed. Migne). (3) The reading **the sister** seems preferable to "the beloved," as in A.V. It is superior in *uncial* authority (ℵ, A, D, E). (Nearly all the minusc. support "beloved." So also Theodor. Mops. *in loc.*) It is of course conceivable that *beloved* might have been exchanged for *sister* from "motives of false delicacy" (Bp Lightfoot). On the other hand, the adj. applied to Philemon might readily have suggested the same prefix to Apphia. The reading "beloved" seems scarcely grave enough for the dignified reserve which St Paul never forgets in his tenderest moments. Above all, the word *sister* distinctly adds to the meaning. For it shews that Apphia had embraced the Gospel, and was a baptized member of the Church, and thus preserves the line of thought in the sentence, balancing the epithets "fellow-worker," "fellow-soldier," applied to Philemon and Archippus. It would be somewhat inconsistent to introduce a mere touch of emotional feeling in a clause apparently constructed with a rather different end in view (see Reiche, 'Comment. Crit.' *in loc.*).

*our fellowsoldier* (τῷ συνστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν)] The notion of the spiritual life—more especially as connected with definite ministerial functions—being a warfare, a campaign, a soldier's life, passed into the New Testament from the Old. Cf. Num. iv. 23, "to war the warfare"—צבא being an essentially military term, "to march as a soldier to war," *i.e.* to perform religious service in the tabernacle [Num. viii. 24; 1 S. ii. 22. So the host of the regenerate who follow the Priest-King in Ps. cx. are at once *priests* and *warriors* (cf. the two sides of the Christian character—*priestly consecration* and *soldierly conflict*—in Neander, 'Mem. of Chr. Life,' ch. IV.)], cf. 1 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Cor. x 4; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 4. The "Gospel campaigns" in which Archippus was St Paul's comrade in

Digitized by Google

3 Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

4 I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers,

5 Hearing of thy love and faith,

---

arms may have been those during the Apostle's sojourn at Ephesus (A.D. 54—57). Those who hold that St Paul had a personal connection with Colosse (see Introd. to this Epistle) will also point to Acts xviii. 23.

*and to the church in thy house*] (1) "thy house" is evidently the house of Philemon, not of Archippus. (2) The worshippers of Christ under one roof are so called by St Paul. We find in Acts (x. 2, xvi. 31, 34) whole households, parents, children, and slaves, admitted into the Christian community. St Paul gives the name of Church to such families, as well as to any ordered assemblage of the faithful, in which when duly formed after the order of Christ, some rule, some are ruled. (3) As vast buildings, publicly consecrated and set apart, were impossible from the nature of the case in the earliest years of Christianity, houses of considerable size were employed for worship—like those of Aquila at Rome, of Nymphas or Philemon at Colosse (Niemeyer, 'Comm. Gramm. Hist. in Epist. ad Phil.' p. 7) —and the name of *Church* seems to have been transferred at an early period from the collection of living souls to the building in which they met—something in the same way as προσευχή became an oratory (Acts xvi. 13—16). (See Additional Note at end of this Epistle.) Are we not justified in adopting the beautiful idea of Chrysostom in commenting upon the salutation "to the Church in the house" of Philemon? "He did not omit the *slaves* here; for he knew that the words of slaves can often change a master's purpose, and especially when they plead for a fellow-servant. Some of them perhaps had stirred up Philemon against Onesimus. He does not permit them there to have any feeling of grudge, as he addresses them with the family. Nor does he give the master just reason for anger. If he had addressed the slaves by name, Philemon probably would have been displeased. See then how prudently he deals. For the word *Church* does not permit masters to be angry, if they are numbered with slaves. *For the Church knows not the distinction of master and slave.* Gal. iii. 28" (S. Joann. Chrysost. 'Homil. I. in Epist. ad Philem.' Tom. XI. 705, ed. Migne).

**3.** *Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ*] The word *grace* would be peculiarly touching to Philemon in connection with the plea for Onesimus. To speak to us of *grace* is to remind us of our sins and of their forgiveness by an infinite compassion. "Think," he seems to say, "how much God hath forgiven *thee*, how *thou* art saved by grace. *Imitate thy Lord*" (S. Joann. Chrysost. 'Homil. I. in Epist. ad Phil.'). This verse (and *v.* 25) exalts philanthropy by bringing it into the highest region of dogma. A prayer like this would be inconceivable from one like St Paul, unless he held the equality of the Father and the Son, and the identity of the operation proceeding from both, exactly as in John v. 19. "It is here shewn that the Nature of the Father and the Son is one, for the Son can give that which the Father gives, and the Father is said to bestow that which the Son bestows" (S. Hieron. *in loc.* Opp. VII. 644).

**4.** *I thank my God*, **always making mention** *of thee* **at** (upon occasion of) *my prayers*] Jerome observes how at this point we have no longer Paul and Timothy speaking to Philemon and others. He seems to turn aside and speak heart to heart with Philemon (*Ut solus Paulus ad solum Philemonem loquitur*). For the expression cf. 1 Thess. i. 1, 2. Note how his first word is that glad eucharistic word with which he delights to begin his letters, after the opening salutation (Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3, 4; Col. i. 3, 4). The source of his joy ("hearing of thy love and faith") may be compared with that of St John in the Epistle to Gaius (3 John *v.* 4), which takes its place with the Epistle to Philemon as the only other certainly and strictly private letter in the canon. (For 2 John *may be* written to a *Church*, and the Epistles to Timothy and Titus are addressed to rulers of the Church in their official capacity.)

*my God*] Luther well said (upon the first words of Ps. xxii. 1) that "there is much divinity in pronouns." Such is the character of true faith. It is ever applying *personally* the promises made to believers *generally*.

*making mention of thee always*] Chrysostom here gives us another of his touches of delicate insight. St Paul would not have Philemon think that his letter was only for the slave—that, but for Onesimus, he might never have written at all. See then how Paul indicates other reasons for writing—one here, another in "prepare me also a lodging" (*v.* 22).

**4, 5, 6.** The reasons for, and force of, the *epanodos* or *chiasmus* in *v.* 5, have been fully discussed in the Introduction to this Epistle. The connection of these somewhat difficult verses may, in the first place, be given by a paraphrase:—"Hearing, as I do, of the faith and the love which thou hast...I thank my God unceasingly, when the recollection of

Digitized by Google

which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints;

6 That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus.

---

thee comes to me constantly on occasion of my prayers—prayers which are offered to the end that (connecting ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, *v.* 4, with ὅπως, *v.* 6, and taking ὅπως as "a final particle," Donaldson, 571) the manifested communication of thy faith in acts of charity may become effective to Christ Jesus (connecting ἐνεργὴς γένηται with εἰς Χ. Ἰησοῦν), accompanied, as it will be, with (ἐν) perfect knowledge of all the range of good which is in us as Christians."

**5.** *Hearing of* **that love** *and* **that faith of thine**, *which thou* **holdest fast** *towards the Lord Jesus, and* **to** *all* **the** *saints.*

*love and faith*] For the reason of variation of the order of the words in Eph. i. 15; Col. i. 4, see Introduction to this Epistle. Faith and charity are two of God's greatest gifts.

**towards** *the Lord Jesus* (πρὸς τὸν Κ. Ἰ.)] The faith which stretches out as it were in aspiration *towards* the Lord Jesus. The *object* of faith is not an *idea*, but a *Person*.

**to** *all* **the** *saints* (εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους)] The love which found its appropriate field of exercise *at*, or *in*, every spot where the saints are found. (The essential idea of πρός is motion *onward*, with the accus. motion *toward*. Donaldson, 'Gr. Gr.' 523. Ἐς or εἰς (ἐν-ς, the -ς expressive of motion), signifies *to* or *into*. Πρός is *ad-versus* rather than *apud*: εἰς is *apud* rather than *adversus*. *Ibid.* 539.)

**6. To the end that** *the communication of thy faith may become* **effectual to Christ Jesus.**

*the communication of thy faith* (ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου)] The "communication" here mentioned as a result flowing from faith consisted in giving, making the poor saints partakers of practical beneficence and liberality. This meaning is very frequently predominant in the word (Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13; Phil. i. 5; κοινωνικός 1 Tim. vi. 18). It probably enters largely into "the fellowship" in Acts ii. 42. It no doubt has the larger sense of liberal distribution, *e.g.* "the communication of the Holy Ghost," as the conduit of all grace. It is at least included in the "communion of saints" in the Creed ("spectat et huc ea quam in symbolo profitemur sanctorum communio," H. Grotius, 'Opp.' II. 849). That "communion," however, extends to another kind of "communicativeness"—the performing of all Christian offices of love—"first, praying with and for one another; secondly, praising God with and for one another, a duty continued mutually betwixt us and the very glorified saints, the saints in rest and joy daily praying for their younger brethren, the Church, and the saints in the camp on earth praising God for those revelations of His grace and glory to their elder brethren." (See Hammond, 'Practical Catechism.' Lib. V. sect. iv. pp. 330—332.)

*may become effectual* (ἐνεργής, a later form of ἐνεργός)] active, energetic, used of a *productive* soil. "Faith becomes *effectual* when it has works. S. James ii. 26" (Chrysost. *in loc.*).

**to** or **toward** *Christ Jesus*] This has been understood by many as an indication by St Paul that charity to Christ's saints is charity to Christ Himself. "Ye have done it unto *Me*" (Matt. xxv. 40. So Piscat. "Christ receives all that comes from us as to Himself, when well done to our neighbours." Scholiast. Cod. ap. Matt. Among moderns, the same view is taken by Niemeyer. "In proportion as he more deeply understood what good things flowed over to him from the Christian religion, so much the more ready would he be to pay back his debt in doing good to the disciples of Christ." 'Comm. Hist. Grammat. in Philem.' p. 9). It may be better to look upon it generally as that ultimate reference to *Christ* which is the life of all true Christian work and alone renders "communication" energetic. We may apply here, with better reasons, words uttered by St Jerome from a probably mistaken connection of the closing words of the verse: "By what leaps and bounds does the language of the Apostle rise to loftier things!"

**in perfect knowledge**] We have in the word which denotes **perfect knowledge**, one of the many touches which link this letter with the other Epistles of the captivity. On the importance assigned to *knowledge* in these Epistles, and the reason for it, see on Col. i. 10. There is no necessity for the forced view of Heinrichs, that *in knowledge* is tantamount to "that it may be known—sc. by enemies of the Gospel—how much good is in Christians."

**of all good that is in us** (παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν)] "πᾶς in sing. without the art. signifies 'every,' or 'every one,' with reference to all the units in a collection, and without making any distinction between one and the other" (Donaldson, 'Gr. Gr.' 354). A living poet speaks of a knowledge of, and appeal to, "the good which is in us" naturally as a source of strength and encouragement.

*Rally the good*
In the depths of thyself.
(M. Arnold.)



Digitized by Google

7 For we have great joy and consolation in thy love, because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother.

8 Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient,

9 Yet for love's sake I rather be-

---

The Apostle seems to mean that a Christian should not merely be in the country of blessings and privileges into which he has entered, as it were,

> An idler in the land,
> Contented only to enjoy
> The things which others *understand*.

It is his privilege to go on and thoroughly understand the ultimate principles which are the source of the vast range of good which is brought within our reach, and is in us as Christians (not merely "in us Apostles," as S. Jerome's commentary would imply, though not his translation). S. Jerome renders the words as they are in the A.V., "of every good that is in you *in Christ Jesus*." But he brings out the idea just mentioned so clearly, that his words are worth quoting. "It may happen that a man may have faith, and perfect it by work; but simply and barely, not having perfect knowledge thereof. There are simple folk now-a-days who bring forth fruits of righteousness, and yet have not knowledge of the things which they themselves do. Whence he says 'that the communication of thy faith may be effectual in perfect knowledge of all good that is in us'" (S. Hieron. 'In Ep. ad Philem.' VII. 646). His observations which follow are not expressly contained in our interpretation, but are deduced from a connection of the words *in Christ Jesus* with *in you;* yet they are beautiful and in themselves deeply true. "Philemon, indeed, has the communication of an effective faith and charity in knowledge of all good. If this exists in Apostles, do not let us think it perfect because it exists in them; but that its essence consists in being Christ's; so that all good which is commended in Philemon and taken from the example of Apostles is good from this that it is drawn from the fountain of Christ" ("Inde bonum sit, quia de fonte Christi ducitur." *Ibid.*).

7. *For we have great joy and consolation*] The reading of the A.V. (χαρὰν) is to be retained. It is supported by the uncials ℵ, A, D, F. It is also most suitable to the context. The other reading (χάρις), which means "holy thankfulness of spirit, gratitude" (Blomf.), would seem to be a mere repetition of *v.* 4. Further, the adj. *much* with "holy thankfulness" is not very appropriate. The two words "joy and consolation" are joined in 2 Cor. vii. 4. The reading (χάριν) may have arisen from a slip of the pen, or have appeared more pious and more consonant with St Paul's manner (Reiche, 'Comment. Crit.' *in loc.*).

*because the* **hearts** *of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother*] It is characteristic that in this short Epistle this word (σπλάγχνα), so intensely expressive of sympathetic emotion in its most purely human form, occurs thrice (*vv.* 7, 12, 20). The unfortunate translation of the A.V. has done much to veil the beauty of the letter from ordinary readers. "Philemon had refreshed the inner heart-affections, and the very depths of the souls of the saints by receiving them. And this is an Apostolic idiom, always to use the word *bowels*, when he desires to shew the fullest love in the mind" (S. Hieron. *in loc.*). He has spoken elsewhere of "rejoicing with them that do rejoice" (Rom. xii. 15). He seems here to rest and be soothed with those who find rest under Philemon's roof.

*are refreshed*] Or, *relieved.* "The compound (ἀναπέπαυται) expresses *temporary* relief; the simple (παύεσθαι) final cessation" (Bp Lightfoot). True love is shewn in works of charity (1 John iii. 17, 18).

*by thee, brother*] The simple emphasis, the pathetic music, of this word at the close is well preserved in the A.V. The same position of the same word in Gal. vi. 18 has unfortunately been overlooked. The rhetorical delicacy of the position of the word Onesimus (*v.* 10) has also been neglected.

8. *Wherefore*] Because of all these proofs of thy love.

*although* **having much boldness** *in Christ*] Much reason in the sphere of our communion with Christ for enjoining upon you **that which is becoming** (ἀνῆκον). It is worthy of notice that this last word, expressive in itself of mere moral fitness and propriety—a word such as he might have occasion to use in an atmosphere external to the Church—is *only* found in the Epistles of the captivity (Eph. v. 4; Col. iii. 18; Philem. *v.* 8). [The term corresponds to the Latin *officium*, and literally implies that which peculiarly concerns us, inasmuch as our *duty* is our proper *business*. J. C. Scaliger's definition of *officium* is *jus actionis ad quemcumque statum pertinens*. Cf. Cic. XIV. 'ad Attic. Epist.' VII. See S. Gentilis, Opp. V. 369, 370.] The balance and propriety of St Paul's language in this place is not always understood. St Paul does *not* say, "I have no right at all to command you," but "authority I have to command your obedience—not, indeed, of earthly rank, but in the sphere of Christ." This mingled tone of command and entreaty is the exact reflex of the mingled respect and affection, which, in his earliest

Digitized by Google

seech *thee*, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ.

10 I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds:

---

Epistle, he claims for the ministerial office (1 Thess. v. 12, 13). There are two spirits which have prevailed in the Christian ministry at different times and in different circumstances—the spirit of the hierarch and the spirit of the religious demagogue. St Paul's tone here shews that he was too humble for the first, too full of gentle dignity for the second. On the subject of St Paul's assertion of authority, see note to 1 Thess. iv. 2. Cf. also *infra*, *v.* 21. The argument (*vv.* 7, 8, 9) is well and pointedly put by Chrysostom: "You refresh others; refresh me, both for *Christ's* sake and because it is *becoming*, consonant with right reason, and because *love* gives."

9. *Yet for* **the love's sake** *I* **rather beseech** (omit *thee*)] Probably not on account of the mutual love of Philemon and St Paul—nor "for love's sake" generally—but on account of *that love* (διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην) which to a Christian is the type and precedent of all, because it is divine. It is quite in accordance with the Apostle's usage ("The Peace," "The Way," "The Wrath," "The Child-bearing," "The Man," "The Woman," "The Name").

**being such an one as Paul, an old man, and as it is a prisoner of Jesus Christ.**

*being such an one as Paul*] The expression taken by itself is one of that class which often introduces a vaunting self-assertion, especially when followed by the name of the person speaking. It is as if the name, the symbol of the person's individuality, appeared to him for the moment something of irresistible grandeur, likely to impress others as it impresses himself. We may compare the "Ego Hannibal peto pacem" (quoted by Gentil. *in loc.*), and the "Ego Franciscus Verulamius sic cogitavi" of Lord Bacon. But St Paul is saved from any such imputation of arrogance by two considerations. (1) His object is purely unselfish. (2) There is a sort of sad half-playfulness about the attributes which follow words usually succeeded by lofty predicates.

**an old man**] Bp Lightfoot translates "ambassador," on the score of language (cf. Eph. vi. 20). For a defence of "aged," see Additional Note. Bp Lightfoot's instances shew that no objection can be made to our here retaining the almost invariable meaning of the word (πρεσβύτης) from St Paul's actual age at the time of writing the Epistle. He was certainly *sixty*, perhaps a few years more. Labour, sorrow, the storms of ocean and the fires of thought, possible sickliness—the sad and solemn maturity which is the portion upon earth of men who believe intensely had done their work. Roger Bacon wrote "me senem" at 52 or 53, and Sir Walter Scott at 55 calls himself sadly "an old grey man and aged" (Bp Lightfoot). In truth, the standard by which old age is measured is pretty much subjective. At an age about fifteen years earlier than that of St Paul at this time (ætat. 45), Chateaubriand writes, "Déjà je n'appartenais plus à ces matins qui se consolent eux-mêmes—je touchais à ces heures du soir qui ont besoin d'être consolées" ('Mém. d'outre Tombe,' III. 402). At different periods of life we adopt a different standard. It has been said that forty is the old age of youth, fifty the youth of old age (V. Hugo).

*a prisoner of Jesus Christ*] This is exactly as in Eph. iii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8—one whom Christ, or, as we might say in our less intense language, the cause of Christ has brought into bonds and keeps there (δέσμιος X. 'I. On the gen. of remote internal relation, frequent with St John and St Paul, see Winer, 'Gramm. of N. T.' Part III. § xxx. pp. 201, 202). The rhetorical force of St Paul's address is admirably given by Chrysostom. But nothing can exceed the paraphrase of Erasmus: "What can Philemon deny to him? He is (1) *Paul* ('quum *Paulum* dico non *paulum* rerum tibi significo'); (2) *an old man*. Something is ever conceded to age. But there is a new plea now. He is (3) *bound*, *a prisoner*. Misfortune adds to the power and pathos of entreaties. But again, he is (4) *a prisoner of Jesus Christ.* They who profess His doctrine should favour His prisoner. It is impossible to refuse anything to one who unites so many pleas." ("Who can suppose that Philemon uttered no cry or shed no tears, when he came to this part of the letter?" S. Gentilis.)

**10. I beseech thee for my son, whom I begat in my bonds—Onesimus**] It is absolutely necessary here to change the order of the words in A.V. in order to preserve anything of the force and point of the Apostle's words. St Paul, with a subtle and exquisite tact, reserves to the last moment a name which abruptly introduced might awaken painful recollections. Not without an affecting introduction will he pronounce the name of "the bearer and the subject of this Epistle—Onesimus" ("et *lator* et *argumentum*," Gentil. 'in Philem.'). So the Vulg. happily, "obsecro te de meo filio quem genui in vinculis, Onesimo." For this simple touch of nature compare the way in which the name of Isaac is reserved in the Hebrew and LXX. "Thy



Digitized by Google

11 Which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me:

12 Whom I have sent again: thou therefore receive him, that is, mine own bowels:

---

son, the beloved, whom thou hast loved—Isaac" (Gen. xxii. 2). For the idea of spiritual sonship cf. 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4. The word (ἐγέννησα) was held by the ancients generally to include St Paul's having baptized Onesimus (1 Cor. i. 14, 15 applies only to the circumstances of a special Church). May we suppose that in the connection of this verse with St Paul's mention of his age there may be a latent reference to the love of the old for the children of their old age, as manifested in Jacob's passionate tenderness for Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 3)? These two verses taken together appear to contain two references to the Roman law generally unnoticed by commentators. "For The Love's sake, I rather *beseech*—being such an one as Paul, an old man, and, as it is, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, I *beseech* thee for my *son*, Onesimus." We have here a twofold reference—a plea for legal *pardon*, a hint at *emancipation*. (1) *I beseech—I beseech thee*—puts Paul in the well-known position of a formal *precator*. (On this single *right* of the Roman slave, see Introduction to this Epistle.) (2) The hint at the *emancipation* is contained in the recognition of Onesimus by St Paul as a *son*. "*Adoption* should be recognized among the legal forms of enfranchisement, since it received sanction from the law, and with the title of son conferred the right of the family" ("Apud Catonem benè scriptum refert antiquitas servos, si a domino adoptati sint, ex hoc ipso posse liberari." 'Instit.' I. xi. 12. See on this subject, Wallon, 'Histoire de l'Esclavage,' II. 386). May there be a yet further allusion? St Paul, indeed, *hopes* to see Philemon again (*v.* 22). Yet he may die. In these literally *precativa verba* ("I beseech," "I beseech thee," *vv.* 9, 10), in what may be his last will and testament, he lays upon Philemon, as if his heir, the duty, not only of *pardoning* but of giving *manumission* to the penitent slave. (On *testamentary manumission*, and enfranchisement *verbis precativis* with a beautiful specimen of such enfranchisement in a monumental inscription, copied from Orelli (4359), see Wallon, II. 387—388.)

11. *Which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but* **as it is to thee and to me right profitable**] The word Onesimus means *profitable*. The Apostle tenderly and pathetically touches upon this, giving a *synonym* for Onesimus with two different prefixes (ἄχρηστον, εὔχρηστον). To read such latent half-prophecies in names seems to be an incident of human nature (cf. Ruth i. 20). See also the name of Jabez, the *Tristram* of the Old Testament (1 Chro. iv. 9); and the beautiful lines in which Sir Tristram anticipates a sorrowful and premature death from the name given to him by his dying mother. "*Tristram* art thou called for my death's sake" (M. Arnold, 'Tristram and Iseult'). The further allusion to the word *Christ* as then pronounced (ἄχρηστον, εὔχρηστον, as if "formerly *without Christ*," now *right Christian*), appears to be extremely probable (see Introd.). It is worthy of note that the word was a common name of slaves, and, indeed, seems to have been applied to a maid, just like *bonne* in French. (The one servant in a poor family, consisting of grandmother, husband, wife, and child, is spoken of χ' ἥδε ἡ χρηστή, Athen. II. p. 55, quoted by M. Wallon, II. 243.) Note St Paul's intense conviction of the remedial and restorative power of the Gospel. In the beginning of the Epistle he speaks of fully developed Christian knowledge as a knowledge not only of a world of glory *above* us, but of a world of good *in* us (*v.* 6). In the strength of that conviction he is assured that Onesimus will make good his name; that the *unchristian* will become *Christian*, the *useless useful*. The unprofitableness *may* refer to theft (*v.* 18)—like the Latin *inutilis*, to which Cicero joins an explanatory *perniciosus*, 'Invent.' I. 44; cf. the ἀχρεῖος δοῦλος, Matt. xxv. 30—certainly not to the idea of some moderns, that Onesimus had been sent to Rome by Philemon upon business, and kept too long by St Paul; for St Paul would then have asked pardon for himself. (Heinrichs, answered by Niemeyer, 'Comment. Hist. Gr. in Philem.' p. 12.) It was the doctrine of the Roman jurists that a *year* of servitude corrupted a slave through and through; that he was *veterator*, *veteranus* ("sunt autem *veterana* quæ *anno continuo* in urbe servierunt." See the quotations in Wallon, 'Histoire de l'Esclavage,' I. lxxv., II. 62, 277). St Paul could believe in the moral restoration even of a slave who was a *veteran*. He knew that Onesimus was a Christian, and that every Christian is a better man for being so. "Every thing shall live whither the river cometh" (Ezek. xlvii. 9).

12. *Whom I* **send** *again* (ἀνέπεμψα, in principle an epistolary aor. used for present. Cf. ἔγραψα, *vv.* 19, 21)] From Col. iv. 7, 9 also it is clear that Onesimus accompanied this letter.

**him, that is my very heart**] (The very shortened form, viz. αὐτόν, τουτέστιν τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα, is probably correct. See Lightfoot, and Reiche, 'Comment. Crit.' *in loc.*) The Apostle's voice may have quivered

Digitized by Google

13 Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel:

14 But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly.

---

with emotion, and the word *receive* hovering upon his lips (it occurs below, *v.* 17) have been suspended—**my very heart**, τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα—so *meum corculum* (Plaut., quoted by Gentil.). For the sentiment cf. "Quicquid officii...in eum contuleris, id tu existimabis *in me ipsum* contulisse." Cic. 'Epist.' XIII. 53. The word which we render *heart* was peculiarly used of *children* (see many instances in Pricæus and Wetstein. Artemidorus says expressly, οἱ παῖδες σπλάγχνα λέγονται, I. 46, quoted by Niemeyer, *in loc.* p. 13).

13, 14. **Whom I was wishing...but without thy consent I willed**, or **made up my mind** (ἐβουλόμην...ἠθέλησα)] We should note the careful distinction between the *inchoative imperfect* and the definite isolated action of the *aorist*. "It implies that a certain thing was going on at a specified time, but excludes the notion that the end of the action was attained" (Donaldson, 'Gk. Gr.' 409). Hence the imp. in many cases merges the idea of *frequency* in that of *incompleteness*. (This is not exactly the Hebraizing *latent optative* of the imp. ηὐχόμην, Rom. ix. 3. Niemeyer, p. 13.) "What kept floating before my mind as a *wish* which I could not justify myself in attempting deliberately to turn into fact was to keep Onesimus here with me. What I actually determined was to do nothing without your free and full consent." The scholastic distinction between *velleity* (preserved in the French "velléité") and volition sufficiently explains the thought.

13. *that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in* **the bonds which come of the Gospel**] "In thy stead." A delicate assumption of Philemon's tender affection, as well as of the overwhelming obligation under which he lay to St Paul. That obligation extended even to personal *ministration*, such as might lighten some of the inconveniences of captivity.

*in the bonds* **which come of the Gospel** (ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)] The gen. of remote internal relation, "ob annuntiationem Christi." The bonds were not fastened upon him by crime, or ambition, or self-will. Their cause was the Gospel. Commentators have naturally referred to the glowing passages in which Ignatius appeals to his chains. One of these well illustrates the Apostle's meaning here. "My chains exhort you, which I bear about for the sake of Jesus Christ." 'Ep. ad Trallian.' XI. "He is my witness, in whom I am bound." 'Ep. ad Philad.' VII.

14. *But without thy* **will**, or **assent** (χωρὶς τῆς σῆς γνώμης, *te invito*)] The A.V. translates the Greek word here by *mind*, as it does also in "these have one *mind*" (Rev. xvii. 13).

**I willed**, or **made up my mind** *to do nothing* (οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα)] The *objective* neg. marks the transition from the inner sphere of undecided *inclinations* to the definite act of determination which conducts to the sphere of *fact*. This final resolution was, no doubt, the result of several motives. (1) To harbour and detain a slave, who applied to him to become a *precator*, beyond a limited period, would have been distinctly to violate the Roman law. (2) The Apostle might have seemed to inflict a pecuniary loss upon Philemon by depriving him of a "chattel personal," and morally constraining him to put up with the loss by imposing a severe strain upon the bonds of friendship. (3) Onesimus, in the depth and reality of his repentance, saw the duty of returning. What truer piece of restitution was ever made? (4) St Paul was peculiarly "sensitive" as to the scandal which the Church might occasion, if slaves received encouragement to become fugitives (Col. iii. 22, in the Epistle which went off at the same time with this, shews that St Paul thus felt. This feeling did not lessen as time went on, 1 Tim. vi. 1. See the interesting note of Sc. Gentilis, *in loc.*).

*that* **this benefit of thine**] This good action of thine.

*should not be as it were of necessity*] "It must not wear even *the appearance* of constraint." (This is the force of ὡς in ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην. 'Colossians and Philemon,' Bp Lightfoot, p. 342. Commentators aptly quote the words of Pliny—"Vereor ne videar non rogare sed cogere"—in the Epistle so often quoted as a parallel to this, Plin. 'Ep.' IX. 21.) "God loveth a *cheerful* giver."

*but willingly* (κατὰ ἑκούσιον)] the translation in the LXX. of בנדבה, "in free will," *spontaneity* (Fuerst, 'Concord.' 681, who connects it with the Arabic *na-daba*), in the middle sense of *impelling oneself by one's own will*, Num. xv. 3, and, with very slight change of the same word (ἑκουσίως), Ps. liii. 6 (liv. 6, A.V.). St Jerome from this passage justly deduces as a conclusion that St Paul held the principle that "nothing in moral action is good which is not voluntary." He applies it to the solution of the question which has been so often asked, "why God did not make men absolutely good?" "God might have made man good, without man's will. But, had He done so, the good would not have been *volun-*

Digitized by Google

15 For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever;

16 Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more

---

*tary*, but *necessary*. But what is necessarily good is not good in the highest sense, and is even relatively and in another point of view evil. Therefore, in leaving us to our own free will, He made us more truly after His image and likeness" (S. Hieron. 'Comment. in Ep. ad Phil.' VII. 649, ed. Migne). It is surely a fair inference from St Paul's lofty view of the necessity of *voluntariness* to right moral action that the fatalistic conclusions drawn from some passages in his Epistles must be false.

15. *For*] The Apostle uses this word, because he is about to suggest another reason for his decision (Bp Lightfoot).

**it may be** (τάχα...)] The word (*perhaps*, A.V.) is used to express every degree of contingency from the faintest possibility to the highest probability. Two reasons may underlie the peculiar timidity and hesitation implied by the word (*cautè*, *timidè*, *trepidanter*, *non toto fixo gradu*, Hieron. *in loc.*). (1) This "departure" might have been allowed with a view to a higher good. This case might have been like Joseph's. "Be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither, *for God did send me before you to preserve life*" (Gen. xlv. 5). Certainly a beginning which appeared so unpromising looked like the very path that had led to happiness. Had not Onesimus fled from Philemon, he would not have arrived in Rome, nor have found St Paul. Had not Paul been imprisoned, Onesimus would never have believed, or been baptized, or become a minister of Christ—perhaps a Bishop and martyr. Taking the two extreme points of the story, and connecting them together, it might be said, Onesimus became a minister of the Gospel, *because* he fled from his master. St Paul softens the sentence by the words, **it may be**, "because the judgments of God are hidden, and it is culpably rash to pronounce *certainly* on that which must be *doubtful* for creatures like ourselves" (S. Hieron.). May not one such as the Christian Church believes St Paul to have been—who "in his Epistles instructed the people of God, not only those who were directly addressed by him, but those who were foreseen in the future" (S. Aug. 'De Civ. D.' XIV. 9)—have guarded by this word against such excessive conclusions as have been drawn from other passages, and indeed from this? Thus, one commentator, whose logical clearness deserves to be gratefully acknowledged, after citing Luke xxii. 32, Rom. viii. 28 in illustration of this verse, adds—"To the elect *all things*, and *therefore their sins*, frequently turn out for good by God's Providence." (Piscat. 'Analys. Log. Epp. Pauli,' p. 165.) (2) But a second reason for the Apostle's reserve may be found. If he had not so qualified his statement, slaves might have appealed with too much readiness to the example of Onesimus ("Ut si non posuisset *forsitan*, *omnibus servis* fugiendum esset, *ut apostolici* fierent." S. Hieron. 'Comment. in Philem.' VII. 650). It may be added that nearly throughout this Epistle we enjoy the advantage of finding Jerome and Chrysostom at their best.

*for* **this cause** (διὰ τοῦτο)] here evidently referring to the following *that* (ἵνα) a few words later, "to this end, that."

*he* **was parted from thee**] This word (with *wronged*, *oweth*, *v.* 18) forms a special characteristic of that rhetoric of the heart of which St Paul was such a master. The slave's *flight* is put as gently as human language can put it. "It is not, 'for this cause he *fled*,' but, 'for this cause he was *parted*;' since he wishes to soothe Philemon's anger" (S. Chrysost. *in loc.*). Such is the prompting of Christian charity, which will never blacken or exaggerate the faults and sins of any penitent. With this lofty idea of the Providence of God, which made all things work together for the good of Onesimus, *contrast* the frigid cynicism which could not believe that God cared for such contemptible creatures ("quasi vero curent divina de servis." Macrob. 'Satir.' I. 16).

*for* **an hour** (πρὸς ὥραν)] Shakespeare's "little hour." It is used for a very brief space of time in the "one hour" of Matt. xxvi. 40; Rev. xviii. 10, 17, 19: in the same way as here in 2 Cor. vii. 8; Gal. ii. 5; John v. 35 (see Additional Note).

*that thou* **mightest have him fully** (less probably, "have him back in return," *i.e.* for the temporary separation) *for ever* (ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς)] There may probably be in the word rendered *for ever* an allusion to that which is written in the Hebrew law about the slavery of "the children of the strangers that sojourned among the Israelites." "For ever ye shall impose slavery upon them" (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Lev. xxv. 46, LXX. So with the Hebrew brother, voluntarily addicting himself to bondage, οἰκέτης εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Deut. xv. 17; Exod. xxi. 6). Onesimus was to be his master's property—his to have and hold, to enjoy as his possession—"for ever," as the old law said of the slave in permanent servitude. But in how much a deeper and truer sense! To be with him, not only for time, but in eternity, in the eternal

Digitized by Google

unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord?

17 If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself.

---

communion of saints. The time of the absence of Onesimus, during which he was "parted" from Philemon, might have entailed some little discomfort upon his master. What of that? Why count up the weeks or months? They were but as the slave's "little hour" of holiday compared with the gain of a brother *for ever*. Too many modern critics adopt a view of this passage which may be expressed in the words of a German scholar. "Some interpreters are probably led astray by Luther's version ('dass du ihn ewig wieder hättest'). They accept an exposition which has more piety than truth. For they suppose that St Paul alludes to eternal life. And they even use this verse as an argument that our friends, taken from us 'for an hour,' will after the Resurrection not only be restored to our love, but that the links loosed by temporary absence will be united together more closely for eternity." (Niemeyer, 'Comm. Hist. Gr. in Ep. ad Philem.' p. 14.) Bp Lightfoot says, with great beauty, "Since he left Onesimus had obtained eternal life, and eternal life involves eternal interchange of friendship. His services to his old master were no longer barred by the gates of death" ('Coloss. and Philem.' p. 342). For a beautiful heathen parallel, see Additional Note. The genius of the Latin language enables S. Jerome to bring out the spirit of the passage and exceed all other expositors, by preserving the touch which makes *αἰώνιον* an adj., agreeing with *him*. It is hopeless to attempt a translation of his inimitable sentences: "Nullus æternus dominus servi sui; potestas quippe ejus, et utriusque conditio, morte finitur. Onesimus vero, *qui ex fide Christi factus æternus est*, æterno Philemoni (quia in Christum et ipse crediderit...) jam non servus, sed frater cœpit esse de servo...frater æternus; æterno et ipsi Apostolo dominoque suo, cui Onesimum ut carnis ante conditio, ita postea spiritus copulat." (S. Hieron. 'Comm. in Phil.' VII. 650.)

**16. No longer as a slave**] It should be noted here (1) that there is much meaning in the *as*. The slave might not be literally manumitted. His master might not say "liber esto" before the magistrate. But though *literally* a slave, he could no longer be "*as* a slave." (2) The objective negative (*οὐκέτι*) is also full of meaning, as if he said—"Here is the condition of Onesimus. Be your conception of him what it may, it is matter of *positive fact* that this freedman of Christ—ennobled by an emancipated will, by the prospect of the liberty of God's children—can no longer be *as* a slave" (see Bp Lightfoot, p. 343).

*above a* **slave**, *a brother*] Philemon has gained both in the *time* during which he is to enjoy the services of the *slave*, and in his *quality*. (S. Joann. Chrysost. *in loc.*) (For the brother's relation, see 1 Cor. v. 11. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 17. Jesus called it into existence. Every time the word is used in truth, Christ's commandment is recognized and obeyed, Matt. xxiii. 8.)

**most of all** *to me, but how* **much more** *to thee*] *Most of all* (*μάλιστα*) to me: then, with a bold *oxymoron*, *more* (*μᾶλλον*), "more than most, if that were possible, to thee."

*both in the flesh, and in the Lord*] "Flesh" is here used to include circumstances of external condition, such as country, race, and the like. Onesimus had some relations of the kind to Philemon. "In the Lord" would include the whole new sphere of divine life in Christ into which he had been introduced. Ignatius ('Epist. ad Trall.' XII.) seems to blend a reminiscence of this verse and of *v.* 20 (see Additional Note).

**17.** *If thou count me therefore* (as thou certainly dost) *a partner*] a partaker in common with me of the love of Christ, in the communion of His Church.

*receive him as myself* (*προσλαβοῦ*)] This word would seem to have been in the Apostle's mind since *v.* 12 (if, as is most probable, it does not occur there). Some commentators (after Gentilis) take it as a picturesque word, expressive of the gently outstretched hand with which we raise and receive the suppliant or fallen. "If those who fly to the brazen statues of kings escape their pursuers, how much more those who fly to the cross of Christ!" (We might, however, if it were so, expect the gen. not the accus.) The word rather means "to take as one's helper or partner, to take to oneself."

*as myself*] And who so likely to be received with honour by Philemon as Paul? Aquinas quotes, "Let thy soul love a good servant, and deprive him not of his liberty." Ecclus. vii. 21 ('Comment. in N. T.' fol. CCCXI. 1532). At this point. the reader might expect a few decisive words to follow, containing a point-blank claim for the manumission of Onesimus. All has led up to such a *dénouement* of the story, and we are disappointed at being defrauded of the result. St Paul's reasons for not going further have been examined at length in the Introduction to this Epistle. It may be added that slavery is *virtually*, in the scholastic sense of the word, abolished in such passages of St Paul as 1 Cor. vii. 22; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9. Niemeyer appositely adds: "Isid. Pelusiot. ('Epist.' I. 142) felt rightly the spirit of Gospel-teaching on the condition of Chris-

Digitized by Google

18 If he hath wronged thee, or oweth *thee* ought, put that on mine account;

19 I Paul have written *it* with mine own hand, I will repay *it:* albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides.

20 Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my bowels in the Lord.

21 Having confidence in thy obe-

---

tian slaves. For he wrote to one Iron, whose slave had taken shelter with him in terror of his master's wrath. Isidore expressed his astonishment that the man called himself Iron's slave, adding, 'I can scarcely suppose that the Christian Iron has a slave, seeing that he knows the grace which has made all men free.'" (Niemeyer, 'Comment. Hist. Gram.' p. 17.)

**18.** *If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought*] The form only in this sentence is hypothetical. The aor. (ἠδίκησεν), followed by the imp. (ἐλλόγα), *really* gives up all doubt upon the question. The case is put as one which is absolutely unquestionable. (Winer, 'Gr. Gr.' Part III. § xli. p. 303—308.) No doubt Onesimus robbed his master when he ran away. The *consequence* of this is a debt at present unpaid. He wronged Philemon once for all, and consequently is in debt. "If he has stolen—as he has done—and so is in debt." For the subtle delicacy of St Paul's rhetoric in avoiding the word *stolen*, see note on *v.* 15. Flight and theft were instinctively associated in the minds of Romans as the kindred offences of slaves. In the Code of Justinian the "Tit. de Servis Fugitivis" follows that "De Furto." The warrant with the slave was "furem non esse, fugitivum non esse." Cf. the lines

A pedibus didicere manus peccare protervæ.
Non miror furem qui fugitivus erat

It will be observed that St Paul's teaching was not socialistic. Not private property, but the abstraction of it, was theft in his estimation.

*put that on mine account* (ἐλλόγα—so Tisch. and Lightfoot—or ἐλλόγει)] The word is rare. It is only used twice in the New Testament; once here, and again in Rom. v. 13 of the imputation of sin. Into the circle of Hebraistic Greek it comes only in 'Psalter. Salom.' 16, "Reckon not (οὐκ ἐλλόγεσον) with the sinner unto destruction." Considering the rareness of the word, and the peculiar application of it, can the Apostle be pointing to an imitation of the great *imputation?* "If He took our infirmities and bare our stripes, the Apostle in like manner puts himself for Onesimus, and pledges himself for his debt." (S. Hieron. VII. 651.) Philemon would receive a magnificent recompense—for a fugitive slave, a brother for ever; for the money he lost, an Apostle as his debtor.

**19. I Paul have written with mine own hand, I will repay**] St Paul may have written the whole of this letter with his own hand, contrary to his usual practice (S. Hieron. *ut supra*). What a precious relic, in that case, for Philemon and his family! But it may also be (1) that St Paul's autograph begins with the words (*v.* 19) ἐγὼ Παῦλος, and ends with ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω, which would form a legal bond (the ἔγραψα, epistolary in principle, was used in signatures to bonds); or (2) it may extend to the close of *v.* 20. "Paul snatched the pen, and to give his letter the value of a real bond, added the words *vv.* 19, 20" (Renan, 'L'Antechrist,' p. 97).

*thou owest unto me even thine own self besides*] The word *owest beside* (προσοφείλεις) points back to "he oweth" (*v.* 18). "If he owes, as he does, I will pay it. Here is my bond signed—not to say that whatever Onesimus owes you, you owe me as much. Yes! and into the bargain you owe me your very true self, your new life, your better and renewed nature."——"These verses are not to be legally dissected. They are written in a spirit which has at once pathos and even elegant wit. Interp. might have dispensed with long discussions, founded upon the civil law, examining whether the words are to be understood of *fidejussio*, or *expromissio*, or *constitutum.* He uses, as if in sportive mood, serious terms of law, and pledges himself by his *signature* as if to a bond." (Niemeyer, 'Comm. Hist. Gr.' p. 17.) Full information on the legal questions mentioned in this note will be found in the commentary of Scipio Gentilis.

**20.** *Yea* (ναὶ)] Introducing an affectionate appeal, like our *Ah!* Cf. Phil. iv. 3.

I] The emphatic *I* here again shews how completely he identifies himself with Onesimus.

**may I have profit** *of thee* (σου ὀναίμην)] He still plays upon the word Onesimus. The verb to "have profit" was certainly used with a special reference to *parents* being helped by their *children.* "My child! you can do something for me. Do it."

*refresh my* **heart in Christ**] We have here a proof of the thoughtful care with which St Paul uses words. He had said that "the hearts of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother" (*v.* 7). He now seems to point back, and say, "What you have done for others, do for me. You have refreshed other hearts, refresh mine."

**21.** *Having confidence in thy obedience*]

Digitized by Google

dience I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say.

22 But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.

---

Those who think it necessary here to apologise for the commanding tone which St Paul unquestionably uses (Niemeyer, *in loc.*, Kopp, 'ad Rom.' I. 5), have scarcely considered such passages as 1 Thess. iv. 2; Philem. *v.* 8 (see notes). The Apostles were not winning demagogues; they were official rulers of the Church (see the "laying of money at the Apostles' feet," Acts iv. 37). The construction (πεποιθώς, with *dative* of the thing confided in; viz. "thy obedience"), found in a few places of the LXX. (2 K. xviii. 20; Prov. xiv. 16; Isai. xxviii. 17), is in classical Greek loftily *poetic*.

*I* **write** *unto thee*] Epistolary aorist.

**knowing that even beyond what I say thou wilt do** (καὶ ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω)] What was the something which lay outside of, beyond and over, the wide range of all which St Paul had claimed—forgiveness of two great offences on the part of Onesimus, deletion of his debt, his exaltation and ennoblement into a brother? There were overwhelming reasons why St Paul should not demand the manumission of Onesimus. The slave would thus have been forced by St Paul's action into a position in which he would have derived an enomous gain from gross wrong-doing. Philemon, besides, would have been a pecuniary loser without a free and hearty consent. Yet there has been a very general feeling that the word *liberty* fills St Paul's heart, hangs upon his lips though unuttered, and hovers over his pen though unwritten. ("Paul seems tacitly to desire something of the kind from Philemon. The captivity of Paul was the manumission of Onesimus." Scip. Gentil. *in loc.* "It is probable that the words '*even beyond what I say*' may contain an allusion to a grant of liberty to the slave. Perhaps also they may modestly refer to other matters, such as possibly sending Onesimus back to Rome." Niemeyer, 'Comment. Hist. Gr.' p. 20.)

22. *But* **further**, or **also** (ἅμα δέ)] This adverb originally means simply "conjunction." He conjoins and couples this with his other requests (see Donaldson, 'Gr. Gr.' *Etymology*, p. 50).

**be preparing me** *a lodging* (ἑτοίμαζέ μοι ξενίαν)] The word (ξενία) in classical Greek always signifies "hospitality," or "the relation of guest-friend," or "the position of a foreigner." By a transference to be found in other languages (*e.g. hospitium* in Latin), it came to be applied to quarters, either in an inn or a private house. In the New Testament it occurs only here and in Acts xxviii. 23, where its sense is determined by the "hired house" of *v.* 30. Several points worthy of notice here occur. (1) If St Paul's direction here arose from a real anxiety upon the subject of the "lodging" itself, we shall not be likely to suppose that he required much comfort or preparation for an ample retinue. The lodgings, as Jerome happily says, "were for the *Apostle* rather than for *Paul.*" "He anticipated a large concourse of hearers. This would involve a situation convenient of access; large enough to hold a number of people; in a locality of good report, and undisturbed by a troublesome neighbourhood." Jerome further refers to Acts xxviii. 23—30 as a case in point, illustrating St Paul's habit in such matters. "I can hardly think that it was a small house where crowds of Jews came to him constantly" (S. Hieron. VII. 632). (2) St Paul had evidently changed his plans since writing Rom. xv. 24—28. With the verse now before us compare Phil. ii. 24. (3) Rhetorically, this request would tell doubly: (*a*) "Prepare me a lodging, or arrange for me at an inn." Nay, surely he will be the honoured and beloved guest of Philemon and Apphia. Will not Onesimus be there? And in what position? "It is equivalent to beseeching them not to delay as regarded Onesimus; but, knowing that the Apostle would return, to get rid of every rankling recollection of injury. For great would be the love and authority of Paul present with them, of Paul after the mention of his old age and chains" (S. Joann. Chrysost. 'Epist. ad Philem.' Homil. III.) (*b*) St Paul wrote to a true and devoted friend. This simple direction would excite *hope* and *joy*, the passions which beyond all others make the human heart unable to refuse anything to those whom it loves (see Bauer, 'Rhetor. Paul.' I. 240).

*I* **hope**] Hope, in old English, often exclusively means *supposition*, *expectation* ("I hope he woll be ded." Chaucer). The Greek verb (ἐλπίζω) includes both *hope* (in our present sense) and *expectation*. In classical Greek it is *expectation* more than *hope*. In the New Testament, as here, it is *hope* rather than *expectation*.

*through your prayers I shall be* **granted** *unto you*] St Paul believed that prayer was *impetrative* as well as *emotional*—that it had an *objective* as well as *subjective* effect. He looked upon their prayers as an instrument by which his deliverance might take place (διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν). "Many a brother is saved by a brother's prayer. But an *Apostle* is granted to the *Church's* prayers, for the good

Digitized by Google

23 There salute thee Epaphras, my fellowprisoner in Christ Jesus;

24 Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellowlabourers.

25 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with your spirit. Amen.

¶ Written from Rome to Philemon, by Onesimus a servant.

---

of others (so St Peter, Acts xii. 5—15). And this *gift* is not so much for the Apostle himself as for those to whom he is sent." (S. Hieron. *ut supra.*) Cf. Hebr. xiii. 18, 19.

**granted** (χαρισθήσομαι)] *given* as a most gracious gift of God.

**23, 24.** For the names mentioned here, see Epaphras, Col. iv. 12 (Bp Lightfoot, 'Coloss. and Phil.' p. 29). Aristarchus and Mark of the circumcision (Col. iv. 10), Demas and Luke, Gentiles (Col. iv. 14). All these were well known to Philemon. Jesus Justus (Col. iv. 11) is not mentioned. Mark and Luke again appear together. So in 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11 (cf. Col. iv. 10—14). Of the position of Luke's name, Chrysostom quaintly says, "the last is made first." Jerome adds, "whose book, as often as it is read in the Churches, so often his medicine ceaseth not." The contrast between Mark and Demas is striking. See Bp Wordsworth's admirable note.

**25.** *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit*] See the dogmatic bearing of prayer to Christ, Introduction to Epistle to Thessalonians. "*Your* spirit," not "*thy* spirit." He includes all mentioned in *vv.* 1, 2. "Grace in the spirit spiritualizes the whole man" (S. Jerome).

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on *vv.* 2, 9, 15, 16.

**2. The Church which is in thy house.** This seems to be a fitting place for some further consideration of a subject just indicated at Col. iv. 16. It is sometimes asserted that the word *Church* is nowhere applied to a material fabric in the New Testament, and that there is no indication of a special place set apart for worship in the sacred volume. This is probably a somewhat hasty dismissal of Acts ii. 46, 1 Cor. xi. 22. An eminent writer, whose conclusions it is always easier to question than refute, has stated that there is not any clear instance of a separate building set apart for Christian worship within the limits of the Roman empire before the third century—"though," as he expressly adds, "there may have been rooms set apart for the purpose of worship" (Bp Lightfoot, 'Colossians and Philemon,' p. 243). But it may be asked what were the sepulchral chapels of the catacombs in principle but "separate buildings set apart for Christian worship"? To the present writer it seems clear that Christian authors of very early date recognize such buildings, in some form. (1) S. Clement of Rome, in the genuine Epistle to the Corinthians, devotes two chapters (XL., XLI.) to an argument for order in the Christian Church, founded upon the analogy of the Mosaic law. He reasons thus: "We are morally bound to do all things in order, as many as the Lord bade us duly observe, in the prescribed seasons. He bade both the offerings and the liturgic services be carefully carried out, and that they should not be observed carelessly or at random, but at definite hours and seasons. And both *where* (ποῦ τε) and by whom His will is that they be performed, He defined by His most heavenly counsel. Not everywhere are sacrifices of various kinds offered, but in Jerusalem only—and there they are not offered in *every place.*" (κἀκεῖ δέ, οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, κ.τ.λ.[1]) The fulness with which the analogy is carried out would be unintelligible, if the venerable writer did not intend to include *fixed* and *appointed places* of Christian worship. (2) Ignatius exhorts the Magnesians to come together to the same place (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. Cf. Acts ii. 1) for prayer, and then adds, "One is Jesus Christ...All, therefore, come together as to [one] temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ[2]." (3) Towards the close of the second century, Clement of Alexandria uses the word *ecclesia* in a way which denotes that it was even then currently applied to a definite building set apart for worship[3]. (4) The edicts of Dio-

[1] 'Epp. of St Clement of Rome.' Edit. of Bishop Bryennius; Constantinople, 1873, XL. XLI. pp. 69—72. The date of the letter is about the year 95.

[2] Ignat. 'Epist. ad Magnes.' VII. (p. 137, edit. Hef.) about A.D. 107. Cf. 'Epist. ad Philadelph.' IV. *Ibid.* p. 162.

[3] οὐ νῦν τὸν τόπον ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. Clem. Alexand. 'Strom.' 7.

On this question, it will be advisable to consult Bingham, 'Antiq. of Christian Church,' VIII. § xiii.—xvii., Vol. I. pp. 280—284. On the whole, after deducting some doubtful passages, Bingham appears to make good his position—"that a very singular paradox has been advanced by some learned men in these last

Digitized by Google

cletian distinctly proclaim the existence of Christian Churches (A.D. 284—306), by ordering their demolition. (Gibbon, Milman's edit. Vol. I. 582.) The first erection of them as public recognized places of assembly is traced back by Tillemont to the peace of Severus (A.D. 211). *Ibid.* I. 569, note 113. Even supposing the historical evidence for the early use of such buildings to be much weaker than it appears to be, the principle is sufficiently established (1) by natural reverence; (2) by the great prominence given to it in the Old Testament; (3) by the sanction bestowed upon the noble extravagances of faith and love by our Lord Himself (Matt. xxvi. 6—13; Luke vii. 37, 38); (4) by the necessary outward development of the Christian life, as the inner beauty shaped and crystallized itself in outward form.

**9. Paul, an old man.** Some modern scholars prefer to translate πρεσβύτης "ambassador," pointing to the expression in another Epistle of the captivity ["for which I am an *ambassador* (πρεσβεύω) in bonds," Eph. vi. 20]. Nor is it considered necessary to adopt the conjectural reading πρεσβευτής, as πρεσβύτης is occasionally used for ambassador (see the learned collection of instances in 'Coloss. and Philem,' Bp Lightfoot, pp. 338, 339). But (1) the instances given in our note on Philem. *v.* 9 abundantly justify St Paul's speaking of himself as "an old man" at this date. To which may be added the feeling both of Greeks and Jews upon the subject. Hippocrates defines a man as becoming πρεσβύτης from the fiftieth to the fifty-eighth year of his life (quoted by Bretschn. 'Lex. Man. N. T.' p. 347). The פרקי אבות ("treatise of first principles") gives it as the teaching of Juda, son of Thera, that "thirty years is the epoch of human strength, forty that of intelligence; at fifty one is mainly fit to give counsel, at *sixty to become old* (לזקנות), at seventy to be hoary and decrepit (לשיבה)" (quoted in תפלת ישראל of Rabbi J. Anspach, p. 527, Paris). (2) In the LXX. πρεσβύτης is the translation of זקן, which has no other meaning than that of *age* (once used metaphorically of a nation become decrepit from antiquity, Isai. xlvii. 6) or of dignity founded upon and resembling age. (3) The pathetic and emotional use of the word is more suitable to the tone of the verse than the somewhat lofty *ambassador* ("Paulus senex," Vulg.).

ages, that for the three first ages the Christians had no distinct places of worship, grounding upon some mistaken passages of Origen, M. Felix, Arnobius, and Lactantius, who say, 'The Christians had no *Temples*,' which they take for a denial of their having *Churches*." On the principle implied in having a Church in a house, it has been well observed—"those who were saluted as having a Church in their house were such as had bestowed and dedicated some part or place within their dwellings, to be an oratory for the Church to assemble in, for performance of divine duties according to the rules of the Gospel." J. Mede, 'Discourse on religious places of Worship.' Works, p. 324.

**15.** The Greek anthology contains some touching inscriptions, in which slaves speak of the link of love between them and their masters as subsisting beyond the grave.

> ...ἦν δ' ὑπὸ γήρως
> πρός με μόλῃς σὸς ἐγώ, δεσπότα, κἠν 'Αΐδῃ.
> Brunck, 'Anthol. Ep.' XXXV. i. p. 502.

Another, accidentally killed by the falling in of the earth upon him, is made to say with exquisite beauty,

> οὐ βαρὺς ἡμῖν
> 'Εστ' 'Αΐδης· ζήσω τὸν σὸν ὑπ' ἠελίον.
> *Ibid.* 'Ep.' XXIX. ii. 139.

Some readers may wish to have before their eyes for the purpose of comparison the celebrated letter of the younger Pliny to Sabinianus. We purposely adopt an old translation, as the admirable rendering of Bp Lightfoot is so widely known.

"Your freedman, whom you lately mentioned to me with displeasure, has been with me, and threw himself at my feet with as much submission as he could have fallen at yours. He earnestly requested me, with many tears, and even with all the eloquence of silent sorrow, to intercede for him; in short, he convinced me, by his whole behaviour, that he sincerely repents of his fault. I am persuaded he is thoroughly reformed, because he seems deeply sensible of his guilt. I know you are angry with him, and I know it is not without reason; but clemency can never exert itself more laudably than when there is the most cause for resentment. You once had an affection for this man, and I hope will have again: in the mean while, let me only prevail with you to pardon him. If he should incur your displeasure hereafter, you will have so much the stronger plea in excuse for your anger, as you shew yourself the more exorable to him now. Concede something to his youth, to his tears, and to your own natural mildness of temper; do not make him uneasy any longer, and I will add, too, do not make yourself so; for a man of your benevolence of heart cannot be angry without feeling great uneasiness. I am afraid, were I to join my entreaties with his, I should seem rather to compel, than to request you to forgive him. Yet I will not scruple even to unite mine with his; and in so much the stronger terms, as I have very sharply and severely reproved him, positively threatening never to interpose again in his behalf. But though it was proper to say this to him, in order to make him more fearful of offending, I do not say so to you. I may, perhaps, again have occasion to entreat

Digitized by Google

you upon his account, and again obtain your forgiveness; supposing, I mean, his fault should be such as may become me to intercede, and you to pardon. Farewell." ('Epist.' IX. 21, Melmoth's Pliny, II. 137, 138.)

The comparison will be made more complete by adding the sequel:

"Benè fecisti quòd libertum aliquando tibi carum, reducentibus epistolis meis, in domum, in animum recepisti. Iuvabit hoc te: me certe iuvabit; primum, quòd te talem video, ut in ira regi possis: deinde, quòd tantum mihi tribuis, ut vel auctoritati meæ pareas, vel precibus indulgeas. Igitur et laudo et gratias ago. Simul in posterum moneo, ut te erroribus tuorum, etsi non fuerit qui deprecetur, placabilem præstes. Vale." ('Epist.' IX. 24.)

"I greatly approve of your having, in compliance with my letter, received again into your family and favour, a discarded freedman, whom you once admitted into a share of your affection. This placability will afford you, I doubt not, great satisfaction: it certainly, at least, has me, both as a proof that you are capable of being governed in your passion, and as an instance of your paying so much regard to me, as to yield either to my authority, or to my request. You will accept, therefore, at once, both of my applause and my thanks. At the same time, I must advise you to be disposed for the future to pardon the faults of your people, though there should be none to intercede in their behalf. Farewell." (Melmoth's Pliny, II. 142.)

**for an hour** (πρὸς ὥραν). There appears to be considerable probability in the conjecture of Gentilis that St Paul here again refers to the Roman Law. A gentle hint is given that Onesimus is not to be considered a *fugitive* slave. The jurisconsults define the fugitive as "he who leaves his master with the intention of never returning." (So Cælius and Cassius, Leg. XVII. 'Dig. de Ædilit. Edict.') "St Paul in his gentle way hints that Onesimus had no such purpose. For first he says above 'he was *parted*,' as if it was not his own will and intent. Then here 'for *an hour*.' He wishes the separation of Onesimus to be regarded as a momentary thing, of one little hour. The word ποτὲ above (*v.* 11) belongs to the same pathetic art as the 'parting for an hour.' For ποτὲ is indefinite, so that whilst Onesimus was for a considerable period involved in transgression, the impression is left that the whole thing is merged in the 'little hour,' the intermediate delay of his flight being concealed" (Opp. V. 415).

**16.** *a brother beloved, both in the flesh, and in the Lord.* The note of Scipio Gentilis contains an interesting conjecture. "Some understand this as implying that Onesimus and Philemon were both *Gentiles*, and therefore rightly termed 'brothers in the flesh,' which Paul, who was a Jew, could scarcely say. They are rather called 'brothers in the flesh,' because they belonged to the same race and to the same city of Colosse. For it was usual with the Phrygians to sell their children, and one might be the slave of the other in the civil relation. Nay, why should we not conjecture that Onesimus was the natural brother of Philemon, probably the child of the same father by a different mother, a slave? For such children followed the condition of the mother, and were slaves, even to their own father. (See 'Pauli respons. in Leg. Nat.' 5 ff., *de Præsc. verbis; si ut allegas*, 'Cod. ad L. Falcid.') And in Livy we find that some thousands of such children, born from Roman soldiers in Spain, were manumitted.... As to St Paul's saying *in the Lord*, he must refer to the equality of Christian love. This was greater and closer in Onesimus, because he was probably appointed to an ecclesiastical function, like Paul and like Philemon. For he was now designated as a *deacon* (*v.* 13) by the Apostle; but as that could not properly be carried out without his master's consent, St Paul in the whole Epistle aims entirely at the point—though latently and with ingenious reserve—that Philemon should emancipate Onesimus, and allow him to be free, and become a deacon. Neither of these could be done without the consent of his owner. This very matter was the subject of many canonical constitutions. In the Civil Law it is provided that 'no slave, who has been ordained Priest or Deacon, shall become free, if the ordination has taken place without the consent of the master or against his will' (Ex 'Novell. Justin.' 123). All Constitutions and Rubrics are conceived to the same effect, viz. that slaves are not to be ordained without the consent of their masters. The only exception is in one decree ('Concil. Aurel.' Cap. I.)" (S. Gentilis, 'Opp.' V. 434, 435, 'In Epist. ad Philem.' cap. XLVII.). The statement about the Phrygians enslaving their children is taken from Philostratus (Lib. VIII. 'Vit. Apollon.'), who adds that "these nations, and some other barbarians, do not think slavery disgraceful." Whence Cicero exclaims "O nationes natas servituti" (S. Gentil. *ibid.* 390). "In the flesh," however, may simply mean "in the sphere of natural feeling," as opposed to "in the sphere of supernatural communion with Christ"—ἐν σαρκὶ...ἐν Κυρίῳ ("*In carne*, *i.e.* quatenus humano more tibi servus est." Beza, quoted by Gentilis, *in loc.*)

Digitized by Google

# THE BIBLE COMMENTARY.

# The Holy Bible,

**ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION, A.D. 1611.**

**With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation.**

**Now Ready. Complete in 6 vols. Royal 8vo. Cloth, $5.**

## THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Edited by F. C COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

VOL. I.—GENESIS, EXODUS, LEVITICUS, NUMBERS, DEUTERONOMY.
VOL. II.—JOSHUA, JUDGES, RUTH, SAMUEL, 1st KINGS.
VOL. III.—2d KINGS, CHRONICLES, EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER.
VOL. IV.—JOB, PSALMS, PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, SONG OF SOLOMON.
VOL. V.—ISAIAH, JEREMIAH, LAMENTATIONS.
VOL. VI.—EZEKIEL, DANIEL, THE MINOR PROPHETS.

The want of a plain, Explanatory COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE more complete and accurate than any accessible to English readers having been long felt by men of education, in 1863 the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS consulted some of the Bishops as to the best way of supplying the deficiency; and the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK undertook to organize a plan for producing such a work, by the co-operation of scholars selected for their biblical learning.

The great object of this Commentary, of which the Old Testament is now completed, is to put the general reader in full possession of whatever information may be requisite to enable him to understand the Holy Scriptures, to give him, as far as possible, the same advantages as the scholar, and to supply him with satisfactory answers to objections resting upon misrepresentation of the text.

It was decided to reprint, without alteration, the Authorized Version from the edition of 1611, with the marginal references and renderings. Special care has been taken to furnish in all cases amended translations of passages proved to be incorrect in our version. The Comment is chiefly explanatory, presenting, in a concise and readable form, the results of learned investigations, carried on in this and other countries during the last half century. When fuller discussions of difficult passages or important subjects are necessary, they are placed at the end of the chapter or of the volume.

The conduct of the work—as general Editor—has been entrusted to the Rev. F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

The Archbishop of York, in consultation with the Regius Professors of Divinity of Oxford and Cambridge, advises with the general Editor upon questions arising during the progress of the work.

**Now Ready, Vols. I. and II. In the Press, Vols. III. and IV.**

## THE NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. I.—MATTHEW, MARK, and LUKE.
VOL. II.—JOHN and ACTS.
VOL. III.—EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.
VOL. IV.—CATHOLIC EPISTLES AND REVELATIONS.

*** *The above books for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the publishers,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK


Digitized by Google

# The Bible Commentary.

Now Complete, in Six Volumes, Royal 8vo.

**Half-calf, $7.50 ; Sheep, $6.50 ; Cloth, $5.00 per volume.**

# THE OLD TESTAMENT:

**With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation,**

*By BISHOPS AND CLERGY of the ANGLICAN CHURCH*

EDITED BY

F. C. COOK, M.A., CANON OF EXETER,

Preacher at Lincoln's Inn. and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

**VOLUME I.**

GENESIS. Rt. Rev. E. H. BROWNE, Bishop of ELY, author of "*Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*," Etc.

EXODUS. Canon COOK and Rev. SAMUEL CLARK, author of "*The Bible Atlas*," Etc.

LEVITICUS. Rev. SAMUEL CLARK.

NUMBERS. Canon ESPIN and Rev. J. F. THRUPP.

DEUTERONOMY. Canon ESPIN, author of "*Critical Essays*."

**VOLUMES II and III.**

JOSHUA. Canon ESPIN.

JUDGES, RUTH, SAMUEL. Rt. Rev. LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, Bp. of BATH and WELLS, author of "*Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*," Etc.

KINGS, CHRONICLES, EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER. Canon RAWLINSON, author of "*Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient East*."

**VOLUME IV.**

JOB. Canon COOK.

PSALMS. Very Rev. G. H. JOHNSON, Dean of WELLS, author of "*Sermons Preached in Wells Cathedral*," and Rev. C. J. ELLIOTT.

PROVERBS. Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, author of "*Christ and Christendom*."

ECCLESIASTES. Rev. W. T. BULLOCK, Secretary to the S. P. G.

SONG OF SOLOMON. Rev. T. KINGSBURY.

**VOLUME V.**

ISAIAH. Rev. Dr. W. KAY, author of "*The Psalms translated from the Hebrew*," Etc.

JEREMIAH, LAMENTATIONS. R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of CANTERBURY, author of "*Bampton Lectures for* 1869," Etc.

**VOLUME VI.**

EZEKIEL. Rev. Dr. G. CURREY, author of "*Hulsean Lectures*, 1851."

DANIEL. Archdeacon H. J. ROSE, author of "*Sermons on the Duty of the Clergy*," Etc , and Rev. I. FULLER.

MINOR PROPHETS. Rev. E. HUXTABLE, Professor GANDELL, Rev. F. MEYRICK, Rev. S CLARK, Rev. W. DRAKE.

*** *The above books for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the publishers,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.


Digitized by Google

# The Bible Commentary.

**In the Press, to be completed in 4 vols., royal 8vo. Half calf, $7.50; sheep, $6.50; cloth, $5.00 per volume.**

# THE NEW TESTAMENT,

**With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation,**

*By BISHOPS and CLERGY of the ANGLICAN CHURCH.*

EDITED BY F. C. COOK, M.A.,

Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

## Vol. I. Matthew, Mark, and Luke. *(Now Ready.)*

| | |
|---|---|
| GENERAL INTRODUCTION...... | WM. THOMSON, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York. |
| ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK. | H. LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, D.D., late Dean of St. Paul's, and the EDITOR. |
| ST. LUKE........................ | W. BASIL JONES, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's. |

## Vol. II. John and Acts. *(Now Ready.)*

| | |
|---|---|
| ST. JOHN.............................. | B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., Canon of Peterborough, and Regius Prof. of Divinity at Cambridge. |
| THE ACTS.............................. | W. JACOBSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chester. |

## Vol. III. Epistles of St. Paul. *(Now Ready.)*

| | |
|---|---|
| ROMANS .............................. | E. H. GIFFORD, D.D., Hon. Canon of Worcester, Rector of Much Hadham, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. |
| CORINTHIANS.......................... | T. S. EVANS, Canon of Durham, and Professor of Greek in Durham University.<br>J. WAITE, M.A., Vicar of Norham, Northumberland. |
| GALATIANS............................ | J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. |
| PHILIPPIANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, THESSALONIANS, and PHILEMON.................. | J. A. JEREMIE, D.D., late Dean of Lincoln.<br>Canon WESTCOTT, D.D.<br>WM. ALEXANDER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. |
| PASTORAL EPISTLES............. | JOHN JACKSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. |
| HEBREWS.............................. | W. KAY, D.D. |

## Vol. IV. Catholic Epistles and Revelations.

| | |
|---|---|
| EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES .......... | ROBERT SCOTT, D.D., Dean of Rochester. |
| EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN........... | WM. ALEXANDER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. |
| ST. PETER AND ST. JUDE. | J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, and Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.<br>J. R. LUMBY, B.D., Incumbent of St. Edward's, Cambridge. |
| REVELATION OF ST. JOHN. | WM. LEE, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin. |

*** *The above books for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the publishers,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.


Digitized by Google

# Critical Notices

*From Rt. Rev.* HORATIO POTTER, *Bishop of New York.*

There can be no manner of doubt of its great value, or of its eminent success. We have long felt the want of just such a comprehensive and complete Commentary on the Holy Scriptures for our Students of Divinity, our Clergy, and for a large class of general readers. The Editor, the Rev. Canon Cook, has for many years been one of my most highly valued friends. He is an able man; and most of the distinguished contributors are well known to me personally or by reputation.

HORATIO POTTER.

*From Rev. Prof.* W. G. T. SHEDD, *D.D.*

I have examined the first volume of *The Bible Commentary*, and find it a superior work. While it would be premature to pronounce a judgment respecting the manner in which the exposition of passages relating to disputed doctrinal points will be made, there can be no doubt that the Commentary, as a whole, will be firmly evangelical, and that the whole influence of the work will be to strengthen the reader's confidence in Divine Revelation, and put him in a way to popularize it either in the Sabbath-school or the pulpit.

W. G. T. SHEDD.

*From Rt. Rev.* ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, *Bishop of Western New York.*

"The Speaker's Commentary" is a feature of the age in which we live. It cannot fail to mark an era in the Scientific Exposition of Scripture for popular ends.

A. CLEVELAND COXE.

*From Right Rev.* F. D. HUNTINGDON, *Bishop of Central New York.*

The chief merits of this first volume seem to me to be: 1. A reverential, believing spirit; 2. Thorough learning, not ostentatiously displayed, but always present and indicated in the results of scholarly investigation; 3. Remarkable condensation of matter, [4]. Clearness and simplicity of style; 5. A judicious selection of the points of exposition made prominent; 6. Moderate and fair views of the alleged issues between Faith and Modern Science, with a wise handling of objections; 7. A felicitous use of comparative exegesis; 8. A good balance of the critical faculty with spiritual insight.

F. D HUNTINGTON.

*From Rev.* HOWARD CROSBY, *D.D., Pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church.*

The *Speaker's Commentary* fully realizes the expectation of its most hopeful friends. It is pithy and clear, and exhibits the condensed results of the best and latest scholarship. It will do much to put into possession of all, that which hitherto has been the exclusive property of a few erudite investigators. I devoutly thank God for this publication, and expect great things from it for the cause of truth.

HOWARD CROSBY.

*From Rev.* M. W. JACOBUS, *D.D., of the Allegheny Theological Seminary.*

The *notes* themselves are brief, often meagre, and commonly too cursory for the popular need, and seem to be put at a disadvantage by the fuller treatises. *But this work will fill a place not wholly occupied by any that has preceded it, and will add to the scholarly facilities placed within reach of Bible students in our day, for thorough understanding of the word of God.*

The treatment of the great subject of *sacrifices*, in the introduction to *Leviticus*, "*The Bearings of Egyptian History upon the Pentateuch*," and other elaborate articles, will amply repay the reading. And, judging from this volume, we cordially recommend this work, more than seven years ago projected by dignitaries and scholars of the English Church, as well representing the present status of Biblical science.

M. W. JACOBUS.
*Professor Exegesis, &c.*

*From Rt. Rev.* THOMAS M. CLARK, *Bishop of Rhode Island.*

I have examined "The Bible Commentary," which you are now republishing, with sufficient care to satisfy me that it will probably be the most valuable work of the kind for general use which has ever been produced in the English tongue. The common reader will derive a vast amount of information from its pages, and the most accomplished scholar can read it to advantage.

THOMAS M. CLARK.

*From Prof.* CHARLES A. AIKEN, *D.D., LL.D., of Princeton.*

As a compendium it will be prized by many who have access to more exhaustive Commentaries, and will furnish helps fresh, solid, and sound to many who have no access to, or leisure for using the more extensive storehouses of Biblical learning.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

*From Rev. Dr.* GEO. L. PRENTISS.

It is evidently the work of thoughtful, devout, and earnest Christian scholars. Its tone and spirit are excellent; and if the whole Commentary is executed in the manner of this first volume, the result will be a most desirable and important addition to our exegetical literature of the Holy Scriptures.

GEO. L. PRENTISS.

*From the Right Rev. Bishop* M. SIMPSON.

I consider it to be a most valuable contribution to biblical literature. It is not designed to be a doctrinal work, or to deduce religious reflections from the text, but simply to explain difficult passages and to meet skeptical objections. This is ably performed in the light of the most recent investigations, and of the most advanced science. Should the other volumes sustain the same high character, the Commentary should be in every well-selected library.

*From the Pacific Churchman (San Francisco).*

*We hope our clergy will all be able to buy it—or what will be better, let their parishioners buy it for them and make them a present of it; they will be amply repaid from the pulpit.*

*From the Christian Union.*

Thank God for this glorious constellation of talent, learning, and piety, combined to elucidate the word of God for the use of those great masses of the people who are not and cannot be scholars.

*From the Right Rev. Bishop* SCOTT.

The notes are brief, comprehensive, and exhaustive, and in the results reached the mind generally rests with us common satisfaction.

*From the New York Tribune.*

*The execution of the work appears to have been successfully accomplished in conformity with the original plan. It exhibits ample learning, remarkable power of illustration, and an earnest desire to support the prevalent conceptions of the Bible amid the sceptical suggestions of current science.*

Each volume of the Speaker's Commentary is complete in itself, and may be had separately. Cloth, $[5] per volume; sheep, $6.50; half calf, $7.50. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 03944 9668
Digitized by Google